



Republic of the Philippines
SENATE
Pasay City

JOURNAL

SENATE SITTING AS AN
IMPEACHMENT COURT
ON THE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL OF
VICE-PRESIDENT
SARA ZIMMERMAN DUTERTE

IMPEACHMENT TRIAL NO. 3
TUESDAY, 7 JULY 2026

PREPARED BY THE
LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL SERVICE
SENATE OF THE PHILIPPINES

IMPEACHMENT TRIAL NO. 3

Tuesday, July 7, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

At 1:59 p.m., Tuesday, July 7, 2026, the Senate President, Hon. Win Gatchalian, with the Senate sitting as an Impeachment Court, called the impeachment trial of Vice President Sara Zimmerman Duterte to order.

PRAYER

Sen. Alan Peter “Compañero” S. Cayetano led the prayer, to wit:

Holy Father, we come to You today, different ages, *galing po sa* Luzon, Visayas, *at* Mindanao, *iba-iba po ang paniniwala sa politika, sa religion, pero lahat po ay Pilipino at lahat po ay ginagalang ang Pangalan Mo. Sinabi Ninyo po sa Propetang Jeremiah, sa Jeremiah 29:11*, “For I know the plans I have for you, plans to prosper you and not to harm you, plans to give you hope and a future. You love us so much that You made us in Your nature and likeness, giving us free will. Thus, to receive the fruits of Your plans—plans to prosper us and not to harm us, plans to give us hope and a future—we must first seek Your kingdom and righteousness. You called us to be faithful, Lord God, for us to be faithful both in small things and in big things.”

Same with the rules. Help us to be faithful to the Constitution, the Senate *Rules*, and the *Rules of Impeachment*. Help us to be faithful to the rules of fairness. As the prosecution stated yesterday, to hold everyone accountable, from the barangay captain to the highest official of the land. Lord God, Holy Spirit, do not allow us to obstruct justice, yet always give us the strength to obstruct injustice, regardless of the cause and the consequences. *Magalit na po kung sinong magagalit, gamitin Ninyo kami bilang instrumento ng hustisya.*

Lead each one of us to pursue the impeachment trial with fairness, political neutrality, and due process and to pursue the flood control scandal with the same zeal, effort, fairness, and political neutrality. To pursue corruption in all forms, help us build a justice system that is ideal, rather than one that is weaponized and is actually an instrument of oppression and tyranny.

We may disagree on many things, but let us agree in asking for Your love, grace, and mercy upon the nation. We may have different visions of a prosperous Philippines, of accountability, and of fairness, yet may we agree in the words You put in the framers of



the Philippine Constitution, which is found in the Preamble: "We, the sovereign Filipino people, imploring the aid of Almighty God in order to build a just and humane society and establish a government that shall embody our ideals and aspirations, promote the common good, conserve and develop our patrimony, and secure to ourselves and to our posterity the blessings of independence and democracy, under the rule of law and a regime of truth, justice, freedom, love, equality, peace, do ordain and promulgate this Constitution."

Thank you for this privilege to serve You and our people, Lord God. We ask for all of this in Jesus' Mighty Name.

Amen.

ROLL CALL

Upon direction of the Senate President, the Clerk of Court, Atty. Renato N. Bantug Jr., called the roll, to which the following senator-judges responded:

Aquino, B.	Marcos, I. R.
Cayetano, A. P. S.	Padilla, R.
Cayetano, P. S.	Pangilinan, F. N.
Ejercito, J. V.	Sotto III, V. C.
Escudero, F. G.	Tulfo, E. T.
Gatchalian, W. T.	Tulfo, R. T.
Hontiveros, R.	Villanueva, J.
Lacson, P. M.	Villar, C. A.
Lapid, M. M.	Villar, M. A.
Legarda, L.	Zubiri, J. M. F.

With 20 senators present, the Chair declared the presence of a quorum.

Senator Go was also present.

Senators Estrada and Marcoleta were unable to attend as they were both under detention.

Senator Dela Rosa was absent.

PROCLAMATION OF THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

The Sergeant-at-Arms, PMGen Alfred S. Corpus, commanded all persons, on pain of penalty, to keep silent while the Senate is sitting for the trial of the Articles of Impeachment against Vice President Sara Zimmerman Duterte.

APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

Upon motion of the Presiding Officer, Senator Francis "Chiz" G. Escudero, there being no objection, the Body dispensed with the reading of the *Journal* of the Senate sitting as an Impeachment Court on July 6, 2026 and considered the same as approved.

CALLING OF THE CASE

Upon direction of the Presiding Officer, the Clerk of Court, Atty. Renato N. Bantug Jr., called Case No. 004-2026, entitled "*In the Matter of the Impeachment Trial of Vice President Sara Zimmerman Duterte.*"



APPEARANCES

The Presiding Officer directed the parties to enter their appearances.

For the prosecution, Prosecutor Gerville Luistro entered the appearances previously entered on behalf of the prosecution.

For the defense, Atty. Sheila Sison entered the same appearances.

POINT OF INQUIRY OF SENATOR-JUDGE LACSON

Senator-Judge Lacson sought clarification on whether the Presiding Officer's statement that conviction requires the affirmative vote of at least 16 Senator-Judges was a personal legal opinion or a ruling of the Impeachment Court. On the premise that it was a ruling of the Court, he further inquired whether, it has raised the level of discourse to a justiciable issue that only the Supreme Court has the legal authority to settle, should it be challenged by either of the parties.

The Presiding Officer confirmed that the statement was a ruling of the Chair. He noted that it had been clarified in response to an earlier inquiry by Senator-Judge Cayetano (A) and recorded in the approved *Journal*. As no objection or appeal had been made, the ruling remained in effect. He added that whether the matter constituted a justiciable controversy was for the courts to determine.

MANIFESTATION OF SENATOR-JUDGE CAYETANO (A)

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A) affirmed that he raised the question during the previous day's proceedings. He recalled that, upon receiving confirmation that the Presiding Officer's statement constituted a ruling of the Impeachment Court, he did not pursue the threshold issue.

Referring then to Rule XXII of the *Rules of Procedure on Impeachment Trials*, Senator-Judge Cayetano (A) emphasized that orders and decisions of the Court may be acted upon without objection, or, if an objection is raised, shall be decided by a vote of the Members without debate, subject to the provisions of Rule VI on questions related to evidence. He likewise asserted that, although he had raised an objection during the previous day's proceedings, he had not been afforded the period prescribed to explain his objections. Nevertheless, he acknowledged that, during the discussion on the point of order, Senate President Gatchalian has given everyone considerable latitude in explaining their respective positions and that he was instead allowed to submit his explanation in writing.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A) mentioned that the pending *Cayetano v. Aquino* case before the Supreme Court likewise involved the interpretation of the phrase "all Members of the Senate." He maintained that, under the High Court's ruling, all incumbent senators remained Members of the Senate unless they died, resigned, or were removed from office with finality, and should therefore be counted in determining the two-thirds vote required for conviction. He added that he intended to prepare a memorandum for the guidance of his fellow Senator-Judges, particularly concerning the voting participation of Senator-Judges Marcoleta and Estrada. He acknowledged that, as of that day, the Impeachment Court had ruled that conviction on any Articles of Impeachment required the affirmative votes of at least 16 of the Senate's 24 members.

MANIFESTATION OF SENATOR-JUDGE PANGILINAN

Senator-Judge Pangilinan clarified that the Presiding Officer's ruling pertained solely to the threshold requirement of 16 affirmative votes for conviction. He emphasized that the separate issue



of whether Senator-Judges Marcoleta and Estrada should participate in the impeachment trial remained unresolved and could be taken up by the Court in a caucus or during a future session.

MANIFESTATION OF ATTORNEY KAPUNAN

Atty. Lorna Kapunan, Counsel for the Panel of Prosecutors, sought clarification on whether respondent Vice President Duterte, who was reportedly been in the Senate premises, intended to appear personally before the Impeachment Court.

The Presiding Officer stated that the respondent was not required under the *Rules of Procedure on Impeachment Trials* to personally attend the proceedings, as she was already represented by counsel. He stated that the Court would act on any motion to require the respondent's appearance once it is formally filed, after giving the defense an opportunity to comment.

Attorney Kapunan acknowledged the ruling and reserved the prosecution's right to seek the respondent's testimony through the appropriate motions for *subpoena ad testificandum* and *duces tecum*.

REQUEST OF SENATOR CAYETANO (A)

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A) requested time for the Impeachment Court to carefully study the legal issue of compelling witnesses to testify. He explained that while the *Rules of Court* generally prohibits forcing an accused person to take the witness stand, non-accused witnesses may be required to testify but can invoke the right against self-incrimination only in response to specific questions. He then proposed that if the prosecution intended to seek a subpoena, both the prosecution and the defense should submit memoranda in advance so the senator-judges can study the issue thoroughly before debating and ruling on it.

The Presiding Officer stated that the issue was premature because a formal motion has yet to be filed. He explained that the court would follow the same procedure it had used for earlier subpoena-related issues concerning the bank accounts of the spouses Duterte and Carpio and records from the Anti-Money Laundering Council (AMLC). Once the prosecution formally files its motion, he stated that the Court would require both parties to submit memoranda and would schedule oral arguments before deciding on the matter.

INTRODUCTION OF ARTICLE IV OF THE IMPEACHMENT CASE

The Presiding Officer called on Prosecutor Lorenz Defensor to introduce Article IV of the impeachment case.

As Prosecutor Defensor began with a narrative describing the events underlying the charge, Defense Attorney Carlo Joaquin Narvasa objected, arguing that such a narration was not proper court procedure and that the prosecution should instead proceed directly to presenting its first witness. Prosecutor Defensor responded that the prosecution should be allowed to advocate its position through a brief introductory statement, noting that impeachment is a *sui generis* proceeding and that the introduction would help both the senator-judges and the public understand the evidence to be presented.

Presiding Officer Escudero ruled that while the Impeachment Court would interpret its rules liberally because impeachment is a *sui generis* proceeding, it would not permit dilatory tactics. He then allowed the prosecution to continue but limited the introductory presentation to five minutes.

In introducing Impeachment Article IV, Prosecutor Defensor made the following statement:

Honorable Senator-Judges, *noong ika-22 ng Hunyo, 2026, nagulat at nagdalamhati ang buong bansa sa pamamaril sa isang paaralan sa Tacloban City na ikinasawi ng tatlong batang mag-aaral at ikinasugat ng marami pang iba. Ang mga salarin, mga menor de edad. Sa kabila ng kanilang murang edad, agad na kumilos ang mga awtoridad upang ipatupad ang mga umiiral na batas. Ang mensahe ay malinaw: ang pagiging bata ay hindi nangangahulugang walang pananagutan. Ang pananagutan ay umiiral bagama't iba ang paraan ng pagpapatupad nito sa ilalim ng batas.*

Kamakailan, isang pasahero ang inaresto sa airport at kinasuhan matapos itong magbiro na may bomba sa kanyang багаhe dahil mahigpit na ipinapatupad ng mga awtoridad ang patakarang zero-tolerance policy sa anumang pagbabanggit ng bomba o anumang pampasabog.

Sa isang hiwalay na pangyayari noong Mayo 2020, isang public school teacher ang inaresto, pinusasan, at kinasuhan ng NBI sa Zambales matapos magbiro na magbibigay ng pabuya sa sinumang papatay sa Presidente ng Republika.

Ano ang prinsipyo dito? Ang pananagutan ay pinapairal sa lahat, bata man o matanda, nasa laylayan man o nasa katungkulan.

The prosecution comes before you today to present evidence for Article 4, establishing that Vice President Sarah Zimmerman Duterte committed acts that betrayed the public trust, committed culpable violation of the Constitution, committed high crimes in publicly admitting thru a live broadcast that she contracted someone to assassinate the President, the First Lady and the former House Speaker.

We acknowledge the burden of this trial on the senator-judges as well as the Filipino people, but it is a duty that we must discharge together, lest the public come to believe that threatening public officials and fostering a culture of impunity are conducts that may be tolerated or condoned especially coming from the second highest official of the land.

Ang mga kilos at salita ng Bise Presidente ay hindi dapat ituring na simpleng krimen sa ilalim ng batas kundi tuwirang paglabag sa Salitang Batas. Kaya ang paglilitis na ito ay mahalagang mekanismong itinakda upang tiyakin na ang kapangyarihan ay laging may kaakibat na pananagutan. Accountability must apply to all, or none at all.

At the heart of this impeachment proceeding lies a fundamental question *para sa ating lahat*: Can we continue to entrust one of the highest constitutional offices to a public official who, on multiple occasions, purposely and willfully and repeatedly resorted to threats of violence against the very institution that she swore to uphold and protect?

The evidence presented in this Article are not just derived from testimonies and authenticated documents, but from the Vice President's own words, own conduct, her very own public admissions. Her words were neither accidental nor taken out of context—they were uttered publicly, with the intention to be taken seriously. *"Huwag kang mag-alala, Mam, sa security ko kasi may kinausap na ako na tao, at sinabi ko sa kanya na kapag pinatay ako, patayin mo si BBM, si Liza Marcos, si Martin Romualdez. No joke. No joke."*

What makes these threats especially sinister is that they do not come from an ordinary citizen, but from the Vice-President herself, an official who, under the Constitution, stands to succeed the President in the Republic. Such statements carry a gravity far from the exercise of one's freedom of expression; they strike at the very heart of government. This is especially significant given that she has publicly declared her intention to run for President in the next election.

What values do we expect from those who occupy the highest offices in the land? *Delicadeza, palabra de honor*, integrity, and loyalty to your oath of office. These are not outdated ideals. They are the foundations of honorable public office.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER

The Presiding Officer clarified that Prosecutor Defensor's statements should not be treated as evidentiary by the senator-judges. He emphasized that any evidence supporting Article IV of the



impeachment complaint must be presented through witnesses placed under oath and subjected to direct and cross-examination.

Attorney Narvasa then moved to strike the prosecution's opening statement from the record, as it was improper, non-evidentiary, and comprised factual and legal conclusions. The Presiding Officer denied the motion and ruled that the statement would remain in the record. Nonetheless, Attorney Narvasa (C) registered a continuing objection to the prosecution's opening statement, which the Presiding Officer noted.

PRESENTATION OF FIRST WITNESS

Prosecutor Defensor stated that the first prosecution witness would be Senior Agent John Mark Sta. Ana Calilung of the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI), and that Counsel for the Prosecutor Amando Virgil Ligutan would conduct the direct examination.

The Clerk of Court administered the oath to the first witness of the Prosecution.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS

Private Prosecutor Ligutan made the following offer and direct examination of the witness:

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honors, *mga kababayan*, the testimony of the first witness for the prosecution, NBI Senior Agent John Mark Sta. Ana Calilung, is offered to prove the following:

- 1) *Si* Agent John Mark Calilung *ay isang* senior agent of the National Bureau of Investigation;
- 2) He is well-trained and experienced in the field of digital forensic examination, having undergone extensive training in the field, making him competent in identifying, preserving, collecting and authenticating digital evidence;
- 3) *Si* Agent Calilung *ay bahagi ng* NBI Cybercrime Division team *na inatasang mag-imbestiga sa mga pahayag at pagbabanta ng Bise Presidente laban sa Pangulo ng Pilipinas, Unang Ginang, at dating Speaker ng House of Representatives sa isang online media briefing noong Nobyembre 23, 2024;*
- 4) *Partikular na sinabi sa publiko ng Bise Presidente na may kinontrata na siyang tao na papatay sa Pangulo, Unang Ginang, at former speaker ng House of Representatives. At ito ay nakataak na sa kasaysayan ng ating bansa bilang unang pagkakataon na ang isang bise presidente ay nakipagkontrata sa isang mamamatay-tao upang patayin, no less than, the President of the Republic of the Philippines;*

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I object. Is this a speech or an offer?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, with all due respect to counsel, it should not be a—

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the prosecution may proceed.

Mr. Narvasa (C). May I register my continuing objection?

Mr. Ligutan. There is no proper ground. This is offer of testimony. Please, please hold your horses.

- 5) The public statements and threats of the vice president were publicly live-streamed and captured on video;
- 6) Agent Calilung is a designated agent-on-case for the investigation;
- 7) As agents-on-case, Agent Calilung personally conducted and participated in the cybercrime and open-source investigation relating to the subject video and related digital recordings;
- 8) *Sa takbo ng open-source investigation napag-alaman ng NBI na ang Bise Presidente ay nagpahayag din ng iba pang kahawig na pananakot sa buhay ng Pangulo, kasama na ang*



sinabi niya sa publiko na minsan, minsan naisip niyang pugutan ng ulo ang Pangulo ng Republika ng Pilipinas;

- 9) In the course of the investigation, Agent Calilung duly identified, preserved, collected, and authenticated the subject video and other related digital recordings; and
- 10) The last offer of testimony, Your Honors. Agent Calilung will testify on such other matters as may be relevant, material, incidental to the issues involved in this impeachment proceeding, and will identify relevance, and material documentary, an object pieces of evidence.

That is the offer of testimony of our first witness, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. We will now hear the objection and/or comments, if any, of the counsel for respondent to the offer made by counsel for the prosecution panel.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may we move for the exclusion of Agent Calilung for being not previously attached to the Saballa and Cabrera complaints, as well as exclusion on the ground that he was not included in the Articles of Impeachment transmitted to the Senate Impeachment Court.

Mr. Ligutan. Can I respond to that, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for prosecutor may do so.

Mr. Ligutan. *Mga kababayan*, in this stage of the proceedings, the Prosecution is about to present a witness, and the Defense is invoking the facts that this witness is not listed as one of the witnesses in the Saballa complaint. The Saballa complaint already lived its natural life. Your Honor, this is the impeachment proceeding of the Articles of Impeachment filed by the House of Representatives. *Saballa, et al.* is done. That should not be a proper objection, Your Honor, please. As to the number 2, I think, the good Counsel mentioned that it is not part—this witness is not part of the Articles of Impeachment. Your Honor, please, I have been practicing for quite some time. I don't see that.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I allowed to reply also?

Mr. Ligutan. Can I finish?

It's not a ground. And in fact, Your Honor, please, to settle the matter, this witness is listed in the Pre-Trial Order. The issue is settled. The issue is passé. No ground for objection. Let me proceed, Your Honor.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Of course not, Your Honor. There were no rulings.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for Respondent is recognized for a final rebuttal on this issue before the Chair will issue a ruling.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, there were no rulings on the Pre-Trial Order on exclusion of witnesses. We have a current petition with the Supreme Court questioning the very actions of the prosecution. To allow the presentation of evidence that were not attached to the Saballa and Cabrera impeachment complaints would allow the House of Representatives and the prosecution to circumvent the very procedural abuse condemned in *Stonehill vs. Diokno*, and allow the violation of the Respondent's constitutional rights as held in *Duterte vs. House of Representatives*.

Your Honor, the prosecution says the Saballa complaints have lived and died their natural deaths. However, Your Honor, this precisely does not cure what the prosecution did. This does not cure the violation of the rights of my client.

Mr. Ligutan. If I may, Your Honor, please, we move—

The Presiding Officer. The Chair will make his ruling.

The motion to exclude by the Counsel for Respondent is hereby denied. The Chair cites *Enrile vs. Sandiganbayan*, which states that the prosecutors may add or rely on evidence during pre-trial, even if the evidence is not stated in the complaint or articles, because only a summary is required to be stated in the Articles of Impeachment, in this case, and/or complaint, and not a complete list of the prosecution's evidence and/or witnesses.

The Court, in general, will not shackle the prosecution by limiting it to the evidence mentioned in the information and/or the articles, especially when it is mentioned in the Pre-Trial Brief—not

only Order, but Brief—of the Counsel for Prosecutors. But, in relation to this witness, even if you will do cross, you can register your continuing objection, Counsel for Respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). We are registering it, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. So noted. Counsel for the Prosecution, may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor. John Mark Calilung—

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I register my objections to the purposes?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, I think the purposes must be specified. What are your objections? On what grounds?

Mr. Narvasa (C). May I be allowed—

The Presiding Officer. You may comment on the offer of the testimony of this witness for the record.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for the purpose number 3, this is a conclusion of fact and law. For the fourth purpose, it is also a conclusion of fact and law. And the eighth purpose, it is a conclusion of fact and law.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (P). Mr. President—

The Presiding Officer. Yes, Senator-Judge Pia Cayetano.

QUESTION OF SENATOR-JUDGE CAYETANO (P)

Senator-Judge Cayetano (P). I would just like (to ask) the Defense, when you say item number 3, can you repeat what it is? Because I am trying to follow exactly what your objection is. So, either you say it, or he repeats it so we can follow.

The Presiding Officer. I was about to do that actually.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (P). Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS

(Continuation)

The Presiding Officer. Item number 3 in the offer of this witness is that the NBI agent being presented is part of a cybercrime unit that investigated this matter. That's what you're referring to as a conclusion of law, Counsel?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Sorry, Your Honor—

The Presiding Officer. Item number 4.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Number 4, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Yes. Not number 3. So, number 4, and what else?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Number 8, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Number 8, on other threats other than the video mentioned in the press briefing, yes?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor. Correct.

The Presiding Officer. Would that be all?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. We will not reply to that, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Yes, please.

Mr. Ligutan. May I continue, Your Honor, please?



The Presiding Officer. You may continue to present your first witness, Counsel.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Mr. Calilung, reminder, *nakikinig ang taumbayan. Pakilakasan ang boses.* Okay?

Mr. Calilung. Opo.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Mr. Witness, *maaari bang sabihin mo ano ang iyong pangalan, edad, at other personal circumstances?*

Mr. Calilung. I am Senior Agent John Mark Calilung, a Filipino citizen, 31 years old, with office address at NBI Filinvest Cyberzone Bay City, Macapagal Boulevard, Pasay City, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And, Mr. Witness, reminder, you may answer in Filipino or English. Okay?

Mr. Calilung. Yes *po*.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, what is your occupation, if any?

Mr. Calilung. Currently, *nasa* National Bureau of Investigation *po ako*. I'm an agent since 2021, and was recently assigned at Cyber Investigation and Assessment Center in April 2026.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. You said that you have been an agent at the NBI since 2021, *pero* you were recently assigned to the Cybercrime Investigation and Assessment Center at the NBI.

Now, *ano ba iyong position mo* before you were assigned to the Cybercrime Investigation and Assessment Center, *kung meron man?*

Mr. Calilung. In 2022, I was assigned at Digital Forensic Laboratory Division; and in 2024, in Cybercrime Division, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, you said that you were assigned to the Digital Forensic Laboratory Division in 2022.

Now, *ang tanong, ano ba ang mga naging primary duties and functions mo bilang ahente ng division na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. In Digital Forensic, my primary duty is to identify, preserve, collect, analyze, and present digital evidence in court, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, preliminary question: Have you undergone any training as an agent of that Digital Forensic Laboratory Division?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *kung alam mo, ano ba iyong naging training* in that division?

Mr. Calilung. I have undergone computer hacking forensic investigation training, mobile forensics, computer forensics, and photo and video authentication training, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. So, the last part of your answer, Mr. Witness, you mentioned that you were trained—*na sinasabi mo*—into photo and video authentication. Now, specifically, *ano ba iyong naging trainings* in that regard, photo and video authentication, *kung meron man?*

Mr. Calilung. I was trained for two weeks intensive training in July 2022 by MaxCor Interventions, sir, in Digital Forensic.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *sabi mo, ano nga ba yun*, two weeks of intensive training. *Yung tanong*, Mr. Witness, specifically, what happened in that, you said, two weeks of intensive training?

Mr. Calilung. I was trained to perform digital forensic examinations, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, Mr. Witness, you tell the public, what is the objective, if any? What is the objective, if any, if you know, of that digital forensic examination that you said you were trained to do?

Mr. Calilung. To present digital evidence, sir, admissible in court *na ginawa ko na po* multiple times.

Mr. Ligutan. Multiple times—you appeared in court multiple times. Specifically, how many times?

Mr. Calilung. At least 30 times, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And for how long have you been practicing digital forensic examination?

Mr. Calilung. Two years, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. For two years.

Now, let's go back. Mr. Witness, you mentioned that you were an agent of the NBI Cybercrime Division in 2024. Now, what were your primary duties and functions as an agent of that Cybercrime Division?

Mr. Calilung. To investigate cases in violation to the cybercrime law, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Cybercrime law. Now, Mr. Witness, you are testifying in this impeachment case proceeding trial against the Vice President, the Respondent in this case. Do you know the Respondent in this case?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And why do you know the Respondent in this case?

Mr. Calilung. Because she is the Vice-President, and my team conducted an investigation involving her, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. So, aside from being the Vice President, your team, you said, investigated the Vice-President. The question now is, what was this investigation, if you know?

Mr. Calilung. It's an investigation on the statement uttered by the Vice-President during an online press conference briefing dated November 23, 2024.

Mr. Ligutan. So, statements uttered by the Vice-President in on online livestream press conference held on November 23, 2024.

Now, *iyong tanong: Ano ba iyong naging participation mo*, Mr. Witness, *kung mayroon man?*

Mr. Calilung. I am the agent on case of the investigation, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *sinabi mo ikaw iyong*, agent on case. Now, you tell the Court, you tell the public, *ano ba iyong pagiging ahente* on the case? *Ano bang ibig sabihin niyan, kung alam mo?*

Mr. Calilung. It means that I gathered evidence necessary for the investigation, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. You mentioned you gathered evidence. Now, you tell us what do you mean, *kung mayroon man at saka kung alam mo, ano bang ibig sabihin* when you "gathered evidence"?

Mr. Calilung. It means that I viewed, identified, preserved, collected, and authenticated digital evidence in the course of the investigation, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, you mentioned that you viewed, identified, preserved, collected, authenticated *sinasabi mong mga* "pieces of evidence" that you found in the course of your investigation, *tama ba?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, Mr. Witness, *iyong tanong* is, *ano ba iyong mga ebidensya na nakalap ng inyong team?*

Mr. Calilung. One of the pieces of evidence that we gathered during our investigation is the video of the November 23, 2024 online press conference held by the Office of the Vice-President, which was posted on the Facebook page of Harry Roque, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Facebook page of whom?

Mr. Calilung. Harry Roque, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Harry Roque. Okay.

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, *sinabi mo* “you gathered” while *sinabi mo kanina pag sinabing* “gathered evidence” *sinabi mo* “you viewed, identified, preserved, collected, and authenticated—preserved, collected, authenticated. You mentioned the term “preserved,” correct? Mr. Witness, *iyong tanong* now is, *ano ba ang ibig sabihin* when you “preserved” the evidence?

Mr. Calilung. It means that I ensured that the evidence will be accessible at any time, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, let’s go to this video you mentioned—the video of *sinasabi mo iyong isang* online media briefing *ng* Vice-President *noong* November 23, 2024. *Ano ba iyong mga hakbang, kung mayroon man, na ginawa ninyo* to preserve that video?

Mr. Calilung. The NBI Cybercrime Division, through me, initiated a preservation request *po kay* Meta.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. You initiated a preservation request to Meta. Now, *sinabi mo kanina na* na-livestream *iyong* subject video *sa isang* Facebook page *ng isang* Harry Roque, *hindi ba?*

Now, *iyong tanong*, why is it that your request was made to Meta?

Mr. Calilung. *Si* Meta *po kasi* *iyong* parent company *po ng* Facebook. *At* under *po ng* Meta *si* Facebook, *si* Instagram, *at saka si* WhatsApp. All requests on that platform will go to Meta *po*.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. Now, Mr. Witness, what proof, if any, do you have that you initiated a preservation request to Meta in order to preserve the subject video?

Mr. Calilung. I have a screenshot of the preservation request, screenshot of the webpage wherein I made a preservation request, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Who took the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. I did, sir, and I used my laptop.

Mr. Ligutan. *Anong ginawa mo sa* screenshot, *kung mayroon man, pagkatapos niyan?*

Mr. Calilung. I first saved *po* the electronic copies *sa* laptop *ko* then printed it.

Mr. Ligutan. Where is this printout of the screenshot now?

Mr. Calilung. *Na-submit ko po sa* Committee on Justice of House of Representatives.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, with the Court’s indulgence, may I move that this representation be assisted by co-counsel for the sole reason of facilitating the presentation of the documents to the witness, Your Honor please, for that reason alone.

The Presiding Officer. *Sa Tagalog, siya mag-aabot?*

Mr. Ligutan. Yes, Your Honor. *Siya po iyong mag-aabot ng mga dokumento na amin pong ipapakita* for the witness to identify *po*.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much—assisted by Atty. Stephen Magallon.

Now, if this printout is shown to you, will you be able to identify the same?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, we invite the Defense to also peruse the document.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I request that one of our counsels be allowed to peruse the document?

The Presiding Officer. Yes, one of the counsels for the Respondent may look at the document being presented to the witness.

Mr. Ligutan. May I continue, Your Honor, please?



Thank you. Now, I'm showing you—Defense, can we give the document to the witness, please? Your Honor, the document must be presented to the witness.

The Presiding Officer. Give them some time to look at it. Is this one of the documents we marked?

Yes, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. For the record, can you state the pre-marking of this document just so we can catch up?

Mr. Ligutan. Much obliged, Your Honor, please. That would be P-IV-7 for the prosecution, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Noted.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I manifest for the record that this is not a certified true copy.

The Presiding Officer. Noted.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, can I respond to that, Your Honor, please?

This is an electronic copy. The rules on electronic evidence says a printed version of an electronic copy is an original, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the Prosecutor, Counsel for Respondent did not object. He simply made an observation regarding the document. So, you may proceed. As long as the document is returned to the witness.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Witness, are we ready?

What relation, if any, does this document have with the printout of the screenshot that you mentioned?

Mr. Calilung. This is the copy of the printout that was submitted to the Committee on Justice, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Your Honor, please, may I proceed with the next question, please?

The Presiding Officer. You may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Question: Mr. Witness, how faithful, if at all, is this printout from the actual screenshots?

Mr. Calilung. The printout accurately reflects the screenshot, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And how do you know now that this printout accurately reflects the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. I compared the printout with the screenshot and with the webpage of my preservation and found that the contents are identical, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Now, Mr. Witness, *ano ba ang nangyari, kung mayroon man at kung alam mo*, after you made the preservation request to Meta in relation to the investigation you did on the Vice-President?

Mr. Calilung. Meta acknowledged our preservation request, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Your Honor, please, the Exhibits—as they come as they are identified by the witness are also simultaneously presented on the screen, Your Honor, please.

Okay. Now, you said that Meta acknowledged the preservation request, correct?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *iyong tanong: Ano ba ang pruwera mo kung meron man*, that, in fact, Meta acknowledged the request?

Mr. Calilung. I have a screenshot of the acknowledgment of Meta, e-mail acknowledgment.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, who took the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. I did, sir, and I used my laptop.

Mr. Ligutan. What did you do with the screenshot, *kung mayroon man?*

Mr. Calilung. *Na-save ko muna po iyang electronic copy nung screenshot sa laptop ko and printed it.*

Mr. Ligutan. Where is this printout of the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. *Na-submit ko po sa Committee on Justice of the House of Representatives.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *kung yung printout ng screenshot ay ipapakita sa iyo*, will you be able to identify the same?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, we are now in the process of showing you *iyong isang printout ng isang screenshot ng isang tugon o reply ng Meta*. Your Honor, that is previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-8 for the Prosecution.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I have time to peruse?

The Presiding Officer. Kindly show the document to one of the counsels for the Respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, we note that the Exhibit P-I-IU-8 is not an original certified copy and we object to the introduction of this, and the identification of this.

The Presiding Officer. What does this Counsel for the Prosecution say?

Mr. Ligutan. Again, I reiterate. If it is a printout of the electronic document, the rules are clear that that is an original, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa. Your Honor, if you look at it, there's a—on the bottom left-hand portion, there is a mark "Certified True Copy." This certified true copy would not have appeared in any correspondence with *noreply@records.facebook.com*. So, it is not a printout; it is not an original; it would not reflect what accurately was printed out or appeared on the screen.

The Presiding Officer. What does counsel for the prosecutor say?

Mr. Ligutan. Two points, Your Honor, please.

Settled out 2019, assuming that the counsel is correct, photocopy now is considered as an original, Your Honor please.

And number two, Your Honor, please, with all due respect, presentation of evidence, objection to the admissibility of object and documentary evidence happens when the documents are formally offered in evidence. We are just in the process, Your Honor, please, of presenting this evidence. So therefore, the defense may object thereto when we formally offer the exhibits. And that is not happening yet.

The Presiding Officer. As a last point, counsel for respondent, before the Chair makes a ruling.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, true that photocopies are now considered originals. However, the photocopy must be an accurate and exact reproduction of that original, or that printout.

This, Your Honor, may I read it for the record? The bottom left-hand copy, it says: "CERTIFIED TRUE COPY; NBI-Cybercrime; signed, Sapphaira T.; date, 4/10/26.

Is counsel for the prosecution telling us now that this marking came from Meta, the email of Meta, of Facebook?

The Presiding Officer. Can you respond, counsel, before the Chair makes a ruling? I am interested to hear your response as well.

Mr. Ligutan. I am so sorry, could you repeat that question, please?

Mr. Narvasa (C). It was rhetorical, Your Honor. He need not answer.

The Presiding Officer. He was basically questioning the fact that if it indeed came from Meta, and it is a computer printout, why the need for someone to certify it as a true copy?

Mr. Ligutan. I do recall, Your Honor, please, that was submitted to the Committee on Justice, along the way, there was a need to certify that. But be that as it may, certification of printouts of an electronic document is not even necessary, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. The objection of the counsel for respondent is overruled. The counsel may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. He may raise his objection at the proper time when formal offer is made of documentary evidence, and any correction may be made thereafter, or rather before that by the counsel for the prosecutors.

All right. Please proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Mr. Witness, you mentioned that Meta, you said, acknowledged the preservation request—

I am sorry, Your Honor, please. I recall the last question. I have to proceed to presentation of the documents.

Now, Mr. Witness, if this printout of the screenshot of Meta's reply is shown to you, will you be able to identify the same?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, what relation, if any, does that document have with the printout that you mentioned earlier?

Mr. Calilung. This is the printout that I submitted, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, again, as previously manifested, the documents identified by the witness has been previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-8 for the prosecution.

Okay. How faithful, if at all, is this printout from the actual screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. The printout accurately reflects the screenshot, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And how do you know that this printout accurately reflects the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. I compared the screenshot with the printout and the email confirmation of Meta, and found that the contents are identical, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, Mr. Witness, you mentioned that Meta "acknowledged" the preservation requests.

Now, based on your experience, and if you know, *ano ba ang ibig sabihin kung iyong Meta ay nag-a-acknowledge ng isang preservation request?*

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor, he would be incompetent to say that.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the prosecution, what do you say?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, this is an NBI agent that has been practicing digital forensics for two years, appearing in court for 30 times, and underwent training for two weeks. No other person in this room is more competent to answer the question than this witness. Let the witness answer.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Nevertheless, Your Honor, he is incompetent. He is not from Meta. He does not know Meta procedures. The mere fact that he is an NBI agent does not make him competent.

Mr. Ligutan. Can I reply to that, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. Overruled. The Chair will allow it. If the witness knows he may reply. If he does not know, he should so admit also. Witness may answer.

Mr. Calilung. It means that Meta had taken necessary action to preserve the evidence, sir, and assign a case number on it.

Mr. Ligutan. So, it took reasonable steps to preserve and assign a case number.

The question now is, after receiving this acknowledgment from Meta, *ano ba iyong ginawa mo, kung meron man*, in relation to the investigation you conducted on the statements of the Vice-President?

Mr. Calilung. I further preserved the video and authenticate the same, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. So, you said—

The Presiding Officer. With the permission of the counsel for the prosecutors.

Mr. Witness, what do you mean by Meta assigned a case number to it? What does that exactly mean?

Mr. Calilung. It means that, *iyon po*, they have taken reasonable action. *Iyong* case number *po* is for monitoring *namin kasi* multiple *ano po iyan*, multiple requests from different investigation. *Iyong* case number *na iyan*, for specific request *po*.

The Presiding Officer. So, *pag may ni-request kayo sa Meta na i-preserve ang isang digital footprint o data, lalagyan nila ng case number?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes *po*.

The Presiding Officer. *Lahat ngayon na magre-request na i-preserve iyon, ilalagay sa ilalim ng case number na iyan iyong mga request?*

Mr. Calilung. *Hindi po*, per request *po* *iyong* case number.

The Presiding Officer. So, each request will have a separate case number from Meta?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. And the case number for this one would be what?

Mr. Calilung. It is 9116154, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. *Saan po nakasulat iyon?*

Mr. Calilung. *Iyong* case number is 9116154, *nasa* upper part *po*, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. *Iyon*, 9116154?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. You may proceed, counsel.

Thank you.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Mr. Witness, you said that you proceeded to further preserve and authenticate the subject video.

Now, let us go to that “proceeded to further evidence.” What does it entail, if any, and if you know?

Mr. Calilung. It means that I further preserved it using a screen recording, open-source broadcast software studio (OBS). I screen-recorded what appears on my screen—the video, the online livestream November 23, 2024, from beginning to end, including its URL.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, what about authenticating the video? *Ano ba ang ibig sabihin niyan kung alam mo?*

Mr. Calilung. After screen-recording, there is an output video. I compared the output video



with the November 23, 2024 video and ensured that the contents are identical. After ensuring that the contents are identical, I now generated a hash value calculation on the video to ensure that the video would not be tampered until presented in court, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, *ano ba iyong pruwera mo, kung meron man*, that you authenticated the subject video?

Mr. Calilung. I have executed an Affidavit of Authentication of digital evidence dated January 30, 2025, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, *kung iyong Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence* dated January 30, 2025 *ay ipapakita sa iyo*, will you be able to identify the same?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, the prosecution is in the process of confronting the witness with a document that is previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-9 and series, constituting 29 pages including the attachments.

Your Honor, please, the defense is invited to peruse the documents.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, we object to the introduction of this affidavit of authentication. This is not an original copy of his affidavit. This is not electronic evidence. And if you look at the affidavit, even the appendages, which supposedly consist of USBs and CDs, there's no USB, there's no CD, and even the signatures are not wet signatures.

The Presiding Officer. What does counsel for the prosecution say?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please. We will not comment to that, subject to the proper response to that when the time comes in the formal offer of exhibit.

The Presiding Officer. The objection of the counsel for respondent is noted as to the admissibility of the offered document. However, as correctly pointed out by counsel for the prosecution, the proper time to object to the same, and for the Court to rule on it, would be during formal offer, once the prosecution has already rested its case. So, ordered.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Witness, what relation, if any, does that document have with the affidavit that you mentioned?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I just make a quick manifestation?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the respondent? Yes, you may, sir. Please proceed.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, during pretrial, the parties got together and agreed that originals of the documents that were to be marked would be presented during trial. We agreed to expedite the proceedings. And now, what is happening is photocopies of documents that we want to peruse and see are being presented. So, we object to this.

Mr. Ligutan. If I may, can I reply? I'm so sorry.

The Presiding Officer. The manifestation of the counsel for respondent is duly noted.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Please proceed, counsel for the prosecution.

Mr. Ligutan. On page 3 of the Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence, *may makikita diyan, iyong isang pirma, sa ibabaw ng pangalang John Mark Calilung*. Do you see it?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Iyong tanong* now is: whose signature is that, if you know?

Mr. Calilung. This is my signature, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, at this juncture, despite the prosecution's understanding that a photocopy is now considered as an original, but to address the concerns of the defense, I move



that we be allowed to present the original of the documents that the witness was confronted with—I'm so sorry—it's a certified true copy of the affidavit of authentication.

The Presiding Officer. The counsel may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, you mentioned—so I will go back. Now, Mr. Witness—

The Presiding Officer. Without prejudice to the counsel for respondent viewing the same with respect to its certification.

Mr. Ligutan. Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence, dated January 30, 2025. Now, we are confronting you now with a certified true copy of the same document.

After perusing the same, you have to tell us what relation, if any, do the documents before you have with the documents, Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence, that you mentioned?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Yes, counsel for respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). We'll finish perusing, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Yes, counsel for the respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. You may proceed, sir, for your comments.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for P-IV-9h, there is a CD in the original.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, what are you referring to again? P-IV-9 what?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for P-IV-9h, in the original, there's a marking, "November 23," and in the photocopy—it is only a photocopy of the CD. So, there's a difference.

The Presiding Officer. Noted.

Mr. Ligutan. Can we reply to that, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for—let's get all of his comments first.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, the page after in the original is a USB, which is Annex E-1 with markings "October 18, 2024 video CLPPS182." However, in the photocopy, there is no such marked photocopy, there is no such thing. So, the order is no longer the same moving forward, Your Honor.

Even in that very same one, which I assume is P-IV-9k, does not have any date marking, Your Honor. So, it is not the same document. It's not a faithful reproduction of anything, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. The photocopy is not a faithful reproduction of the certified true copy. That's what you're stating?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. What does the Counsel for the Prosecution say?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, counter-manifestation that the documents that the Defense are perusing have been identified by the very person who authenticated and who executed that exhibit.

Your Honor, please, we move that the comments of the Defense be noted, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, that's irrelevant. What we're saying is, that this is not the copy marked; it is not the same as the original, which he says is the same thing that he's identified. What he's saying is off tangent. What he identified earlier, which is the marked copy, which is the copy marked during pre-trial, is not the same document as they are passing on as an original. Your Honor, this is the—

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for Respondent, that is a proper subject matter too, for your cross to point, if at all—the distinction and difference between the two copies—which, counsel for the prosecution can use as a subject matter for his redirect.



Mr. Ligutan. Thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Because you can confront the witness with respect to the certified true copy that is different from what he identified earlier, impugning, if at all, his credibility as a witness, in this case.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. So, we note the comments and observations of the counsel for the respondent.

I got lost. So, it's being reviewed and has not yet been given to the witness, right?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I just register our continuing objection?

The Presiding Officer. So noted and so registered.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Can we proceed?

The Presiding Officer. Before we proceed, the Presiding Officer was not there during pre-trial. As manifested by the Counsel for the Respondent, was there indeed such an agreement that the originals will be presented during the trial by both parties?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Can the Counsel for the Prosecutors also confirm that?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, we do not confirm. I conferred with my team, the team who actually participated in the marking for Article IV, Your Honor, please.

Be that as it may, Your Honor, please, we would like to put into record certain realities of the law. A photocopy is now considered as an original—2019 Amendments in the *Rules on Evidence*. No. 2, Your Honor, please, this is the person who authenticated the documents. So, there's no other person who is competent to testify as to the veracity of these documents other than the witness.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, that is only a conclusion.

The Presiding Officer. So, you do not confirm?

Mr. Ligutan. No, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. You do not confirm such an agreement during pre-trial?

Mr. Ligutan. We do not confirm that, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. So, the Chair would like to advise the parties. The Court understands the exceptions to the Original Document Rule and will so implement the *Rules* in that regard. However, if it does not fall under the Original Document Rule exceptions, then, to save on the Court's time, the party presenting the document should present the original during trial to evict what we are seeing now, perhaps in the next time you present a witness, Counsel for the Prosecutors and counsel for the Respondent.

Mr. Ligutan. We will, Your Honor. We appreciate that.

Your Honor, please, we understand that would be for the next presentation.

The Presiding Officer. For the next, Sir.

Please proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Are we done?

Now, we move, Your Honor, please that the—

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I request that he not also address me directly?

The Presiding Officer. So ordered, so instructed. Kindly address all of your queries and



statements to the Presiding Officer and use the third person when referring to your fellow counsel for the other party.

Mr. Ligutan. Much obliged, Your Honor, please.

We move, Your Honor, please, that the marking in the Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence that was previously identified by the witness—a photocopy—the markings of the same be transposed, Your Honor, please, to the documents that this witness is being confronted with at present, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). We object to this, Your Honor. This is precisely our earlier objection. They're marking a new document, that's why they're asking that it be marked again, which defeats the very purpose of our pre-trial.

Mr. Ligutan. If I may reply, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the prosecution.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor—

Mr. Ligutan. Can I continue?

Mr. Narvasa (C). I wasn't done.

The Presiding Officer. I now allow the counsel for the prosecution to speak.

Mr. Ligutan. So, the hearing will proceed, Your Honor, please, I will withdraw that motion. We will stand by the presentation, the photocopy allowed by the *Rules* and identified by the witness, who actually executed the affidavit.

May I proceed, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. I hope that satisfies the Counsel for the Respondent.

You may proceed, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor.

Now, Mr. Witness, on Page 3, *sa Pahinang No.3*, of the Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence, *may makikitang isang pirma sa ibabaw ng pangalang "Agent John Mark Calilung."* Now, *iyong tanong, kaninong pirma ba ito, kung alam mo?*

Mr. Calilung. *Pirma ko po*, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *sa Page 4 ng nasabing Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence, may makikita din na isang pirma, okey, sa ibabaw ng pangalang "Atty. Jeremy C. Lotoc."* Now, *kaninong pirma ito kung alam mo?*

Mr. Calilung. *Pirma po ni Attorney Lotoc.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, how do you know that it is the signature of Attorney Lotoc?

Mr. Calilung. *Nakita ko pong pinirmahan niya iyong dokumento, at may mga document po ako na nakita at in-acted upon na bearing his signature, kaya pamilyar po ako.*

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Your Honor, please, we proceed.

Mr. Witness, now, what action did you perform, if any, after you authenticated the subject video in relation to the investigation you conducted on the statements of the Vice President?

Mr. Calilung. I first saved the video on my laptop and saved a copy of the video on a DVD and a flash drive.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, you mentioned that you saved a copy in a flash drive. Mr. Witness, *kung iyong flash drive ipakikita sa iyo*, will you be able to identify the same?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor. We object.

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

The Presiding Officer. What is the objection of the Counsel for the Respondent?

Mr. Narvasa (C). The document identified by the witness was the photocopy, and the appended—there's no flash drive, CD, or anything appended upon that. So, there's nothing, no foundation for this question.

Mr. Ligutan. I have to reply to that, Your Honor, please. This is—

The Presiding Officer. You can reply, Counsel for the Prosecution.

Mr. Ligutan. This is a non-issue. I asked the witness, "What did he do after saving the video?" And he said, he saved it in a flash drive, without referring to any document attached to the affidavit of authentication. Basis is laid, Your Honor, please. This is a non-issue.

We may proceed, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I respond?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the Respondent, this is not a surprise. Several flash drives were pre-marked during the pre-trial.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I reply first before—

The Presiding Officer. I believe, [7] [seven] on the part of the prosecution, and several on the part of the respondent too. But you may proceed, Sir.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, that is not my objection. My objection is, the very basis upon which the witness introduced this flash drive was the affidavit—the affidavit. And there was no affidavit upon the—there was no attachment upon the affidavit which they introduced. So, the very questions that he has do not have any foundation.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the Prosecution, before the Presiding Officer makes a ruling.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ako'y magiging ano na, parang sirang ano*—Your Honor, I just said that this witness said that he saved a copy of that video in a flash drive. So, the logical question now is to ask him, if this flash drive is presented to him, is he able to explain and/or identify the same. I don't see any proper basis for an objection to that, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer will make a ruling: objection is overruled. The prosecution, Counsel for the Prosecution, is trying to comply with the requirements enunciated by the Supreme Court insofar as such pieces of evidence is concerned: (1) establishing its origin; (2) to trace the chain of custody insofar as the transfer to a storage device is concerned; and finally, how it reached this court. So, the objection is overruled.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor, please.

Now, Mr. Witness, Attorney Bagalion, please confront the witness with a flash drive.

Mr. Witness, I'm now showing a flash drive that is previously marked as exhibit P-IV-10a containing the subject video that is previously marked as exhibit P-4-10 for the prosecution. Question: What relation, if any, does this flash drive have with the one you mentioned?

Mr. Narvasa (C). May I know if this was appended upon any document?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for respondent is recognized.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, may I know if this was appended upon any document?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the Prosecution will please reply.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. The answer is no, I presume.

Mr. Ligutan. No.

The Presiding Officer. The basis, if at all, Counsel for the Respondent, is the testimony of the witness when asked—again—to establish not only the origin, but also how he transferred it

to a storage device, and, if at all, how it reached this Court. So, the Chair replies, and if that is an objection, overrules the same. Witness may answer.

Mr. Calilung. Permission to unseal the flash drive.

The Presiding Officer. You may do so, Sir.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, the witness manifestation is now in the process of unsealing the object evidence.

The Presiding Officer. Witness will please answer.

Mr. Calilung. This is the flash drive where I received the recording, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, Your Honor, please, at this juncture, we are about to confront the witness with the video contained in the flash drive.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Kindly let the Counsel for the Prosecution finish.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much. And in the interest of time, Your Honor, please, we move that we allow Atty. Bagalion to transport himself to the technical booth to facilitate, Your Honor, please, the playing of the video when the time comes.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may we know how long the video is?

Mr. Ligutan. We will arrive to that, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. No. I am also curious. How long is this for us to know, how long is this particular video, namely, Exhibit P-IV-10a.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. How many minutes or seconds would this be?

Mr. Ligutan. Exactly, the video is two hours, 26 minutes, and 10 seconds. But wait, Your Honor, please, we will aid the Court in this regard. We will not be showing the entire two-hour video, Your Honor, please. We will be presenting the relevant portions of the video, Your Honor, please, sanctioned by the *Rules* and subject to the Defense, doing whatever they want with the remainder of the video, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. So, what will you play exactly, counsel? How many minutes or seconds?

Mr. Ligutan. We counted, it is two minutes and exactly 18 seconds, Your Honor, please—two minutes and 18 seconds of a two-hour, 26-minute and 10-second video, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. What does the Counsel for the Respondent say?

Mr. Narvasa (C). We object. Your Honor, based on the *Rules*, part of a video documentary must be presented, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Come again? I am sorry, Counsel.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yeah, hold on, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. I am sorry, counsel. I did not get what you said.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Hold on, Your Honor.

Your Honor, under Rule 132, when part of a transaction writing a record given in evidence, the remainder must be shown. When part of an act, declaration, conversation, writing, or record

is given in evidence by one party, the whole of the same subject may be inquired into. And when a detached act, declaration, conversation, writing, or record is given in evidence, any other act, declaration, conversation, or record necessary to its understanding, must be given into evidence. Your Honor, we request that the entire video be played.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, can I respond to that, please? Can I respond?

The Presiding Officer. What does the counsel for the prosecution say before the Chair makes a ruling?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, we do not want to put the Defense on the spot, but that is a misreading of the *Rules*. Your Honor, please, counsel cited Rule 132, Section 17. With all respect to the Defense, that doesn't serve your interest; it serves the interest of the Prosecution. May I explain? Reason: If we read Section 17 of Rule 132, it says, "When part of transaction, writing a record given in evidence, the remainder is admissible. When parts of an act, declaration, conversation, writing a record, when part is given by one party,"—and in this case, that is the Prosecution—"the whole of the same may be inquired into by the other side." Meaning, it's simple: This Rule, Section 17, Rule 132, allows exactly the Prosecution to present a two-minute portion of a two-hour video subject to the Defense the presentation of the remainder of the same. Be that as it may, Your Honor, please, the *Rules* are clear; No. 2, we invoke, Your Honor, please, the ruling that it is for the Prosecution to decide what to present, when to present, how to present, and whether to present at all.

Be that as it may, Your Honor, please, the Defense will not be prejudiced exactly, because when the time comes for the Defense to present their evidence, they can present the remainder of that two-hour video. What we are saying, Your Honor, please, for the interest of time, for the Prosecution's presentation of evidence, we deem that only a two-minute portion of that two-hour video is relevant at this point in time, Your Honor, please. We move for a ruling.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, if I may respond.

The Presiding Officer. As a last response.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, the Prosecution cannot be allowed to present a small, a truncated part of a whole two-hour, 26-minute video. That will not provide the context necessary for the understanding of what occurred during that night on November 23, and also not allow the proper identification by this witness.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, sorry, I will not even reply to that, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. The Chair would like to ask: Who did the edit, from how many hours, two hours?

Mr. Ligutan. No. Your Honor, please, if I make a...

The Presiding Officer. Who did the edit? Did the witness, was the witness the one who did the edit or was it already the Prosecution?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, there is no editing done. There is no editing done.

The Presiding Officer. Who got that shorter portion?

Mr. Ligutan. No, Your Honor, please. What they are presenting are portions of the entire two hour video. And this witness, I think, will be able to identify the specific time stamps of that preserved, not-edited portion. If I may repeat, Your Honor, please, we are not presenting any edited portions, but only snippets, portions of that two-hour video. And this witness, I suppose, will be able to identify which specific portions that he would like the Court to view at this point.

The Presiding Officer. So, when it is shown, the witness will testify and attest to the portion of the entire video that it was found in so far as the time stamp is concerned.

Mr. Ligutan. Yes, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. But as evidence, at the proper time, you will be offering this entire two-hour or so video.

Mr. Ligutan. Yes, Your Honor, please.



The Presiding Officer. And simply highlighting the two or so minutes. Would that be correct?

Mr. Ligutan. That is a very keen observation. I agree 100%, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvaza (C). Your Honor, the Prosecution cannot be allowed to do with this because the entire video will show the context upon which the utterances were made.

The Presiding Officer. That is a matter for the Counsel for Respondent to do and present during their time, because I believe, the Counsel for the Respondent also identified and marked, if I am not mistaken, the same video for over 2 1/2 hours. It can do so during its time to present its evidence-in-chief. The objection is overruled. Counsel is instructed to go to the booth, accompanied by a counsel from the Respondent, in order to make sure that indeed, the USB identified by the witness, is the same USB that will be played in the tech booth of the Senate.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. While they are doing that, may I propound the next question, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. Yes, counsel, you may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, John Mark, listen. Now, you mentioned *kanina* that you authenticated the subject video by recording the same through *sinasabi mong* open broadcaster software (OBS). And then, you compared the contents of the recording and the subject video that is one; and you also said that you investigated certain statements made by the Vice President on November 23, 2024. *Iyong tanong, no?* What particular statements of the Vice President did the NBI deem proper to investigate?

Mr. Calilung. [Well,] The statement of the Vice President, where she uttered that she already talked to someone to kill the President, the First Lady and the former Speaker of the House, if something happens to her.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, the next question now, Mr. Witness, in what particular portion of the subject video—in what particular portion of the subject video—did the respondent utter that she already contracted a person to kill—

Mr. Narvaza (C). Objection, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. Well, wait, wait, wait.

The Presiding Officer. Allow the counsel to finish his question.

Mr. Ligutan. I am not yet done. Relax.

To kill the President, the First Lady, and the former Speaker of the House?

Mr. Narvaza (C). Objection, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. What?

The Presiding Officer. What is the objection of counsel for respondent?

Mr. Narvaza (C). Your Honor, no basis for the question, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Overruled. Witness may answer.

Mr. Ligutan. May I refer, Sir, to my notes to identify the specific timestamp, sir?

Mr. Ligutan. Okay.

The Presiding Officer. The witness may do so, if it is available to him. You may refer to your notes.

Mr. Narvaza (C). Your Honor, may I question what notes he is referring to?

MANIFESTATION OF SENATOR-JUDGE CAYETANO (A)

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A) raised a query, without appealing the Presiding Officer's ruling, regarding the order in which the video evidence should be presented. Citing Section 17, Rule 132 of the *Rules of Court* on the completeness of evidence, he observed that if only excerpts of a video were initially presented, the defense might later seek to introduce the entire recording to provide

context. He suggested that, if both parties ultimately intended to present the full video, the Court might consider viewing it in its entirety at the outset to avoid premature conclusions based on isolated excerpts and to promote judicial efficiency.

The Presiding Officer stated that the Court could neither dictate nor anticipate how either party would present its evidence, noting that the parties retained the discretion to determine their respective presentations.

Atty. Narvasa, upon inquiry by Senator-Judge Cayetano (A), confirmed that the defense intended to present the entire two-hour-and-26-minute video during cross-examination.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A) reiterated his personal view that viewing the complete recording before its excerpts would better preserve the proper context and minimize the risk of prejudgment but stated that he would defer to the collective judgment of the Court should the Members prefer otherwise.

The defense counsel manifested the intention to present the complete video during cross-examination and sought reconsideration of the earlier ruling. The Presiding Officer ruled that only a Senator-Judge, and not counsel, could move for reconsideration of a ruling of the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF TRIAL

With the permission of the Body, the trial was suspended.

It was 3:48 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF TRIAL

At 3:55 p.m., the trial was resumed.

RULING OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER

The Presiding Officer informed the Court that, during the recess, he had conferred with the Senator-Judges, including Senator-Judge Cayetano (A), regarding the presentation of the video evidence. He ruled that, should the respondent elect to present the entire video, as previously manifested by defense counsel, the Court would allow its presentation during the respondent's presentation of evidence. He emphasized that the Court would not interfere with either party's manner of presenting its case, explaining that the prosecution's presentation of selected portions of the video was intended to support the allegations in the Articles of Impeachment and to promote the efficient conduct of the proceedings. He likewise noted that the respondent would be afforded the same opportunity to present such evidence as it deemed necessary to establish its defense.

Thereupon, Senator-Judge Cayetano (A) manifested his conformity and stated that he believed there was a consensus on the matter.

CLARIFICATORY QUESTIONS OF SENATOR-JUDGE CAYETANO (A)

Senator Judge-Cayetano (A). May I ask just one question about authentication? I just want to be clarified.

The Presiding Officer. You may proceed, sir.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). With my indulgence to the prosecution and defense. Just to the witness, please correct me kasi hindi talaga ako techy talaga riyan. So, sabi mo, pag ina-authenticate mo, get the video tapos may hash.

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). So, you get the hash, *tapos you* download the video. *Tama po ba?*

Mr. Calilung. No, Your Honor. The video was screen-recorded, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). Okay, so screen recorded. Then, *iyong hash na nakuha mo.*

Mr. Calilung. *Iyong hash value is kinal-culate [calculated] from the recorded po.*

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). Okay. Then you have to compare that with the original one, right?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). So, the original one, *iyong hash niyan nasa Facebook, tama ba?*

Mr. Calilung. *Iyong hash po hindi po kinal-culate [na-calculate] iyong hash from the Facebook kasi ang purpose po ng hash value is to calculate po iyong value noong mismong video na ni-record ko. Dahil hindi po siya for authentication purposes, but for the integrity of the video that I screen recorded na, if ma-tampered siya during the time na isinabmit (submit) siya until presented in court, makikita po[o] na iba po iyong hash value.*

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). So, is there a possibility *na iba iyong hash ng Facebook* for the same video *sa hash noong sa iyo?*

Mr. Calilung. *Magkaiba po talaga, Your Honor.*

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). *Magkaiba.* But how do you know it's—When you authenticated, how do you know it's the same video?

Mr. Calilung. I manually compared, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). Manually compared?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). But we don't know that unless we also manually compare.

Mr. Calilung. Yes, your honor.

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A). Thank you. I just want to clarify that and think about it more.

The Presiding Officer. Noted and entered into the records.

CLARIFICATORY QUESTIONS OF SENATOR-JUDGE VILLANUEVA

Senator-Judge Villanueva. Mr. Presiding Officer, in relation to what Senator-Judge Alan Cayetano mentioned, may I just be allowed to ask a clarificatory question in relation to that particular matter?

The Presiding Officer. Senator-Judge Villanueva may do so. He has two minutes.

Senator-Judge Villanueva. Thank you.

Mr. Witness, I was listening attentively earlier, and you made mention that the live stream video was recorded using open broadcaster software or OBS. Just for the benefit of the court, could you briefly explain what OBS is and how it was used in the course of your investigation?

Mr. Calilung. It's an open-source na software *na puwede pong i-access ng kahit sino.*

Senator-Judge Villanueva. So, it's generally available to the public?

Mr. Calilung. Yes po. And, *ang purpose po niya* is may two functions *siya.* It's live stream and screen recording po.

Senator-Judge Villanueva. And stream recording?

Mr. Calilung. Screen recording, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Villanueva. Could you explain the capabilities *nitong* OBS as well as any considerations that investigators take into account *pag ginagamit po itong* recordings generated through this particular software as part of your investigation?

Mr. Calilung. *Iyong* OBS *po* capable *po* siya *i-screen* record *kung ano po* *iyong* nakikita *sa* screen. After *po noon*, *makakapag-generate po* siya *ng* output. *Iyong* output *po na* *iyon* *iyong* *mina-manually* compared *ko* with the live stream video, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Villanueva. To authenticate?

Mr. Calilung. Yes *po*.

Senator-Judge Villanueva. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

Thank you, Mr. Witness.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Noted and entered into the records

REMARK OF SENATOR-JUDGE TULFO (R)

Senator-Judge Tulfo clarified that Section 17, Rule 132 of the *Rules of Court* does not require the entire record to be presented in open court. He emphasized that playing a video in open court is separate and distinct from its formal presentation as evidence.

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR-JUDGE PANGILINAN

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. Yes, Mr. President. Just one or two quick questions to the witness.

The Presiding Officer [Sen. Escudero.] The gentleman may proceed. Witness, please answer the questions of Senator-Judge Pangilinan. He has two minutes.

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. Mr. Calilung, *ikaw ay—nabanggit mo kanina na nag-training ka, ano?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. *Hindi lang dalawa—dalawang linggong training lamang ang nakuha mo, tama ba iyon?*

Mr. Calilung. *Dalawang linggo* on the start, *pero* during the *ano po*, during the—*nag-a-ano na ako, tine-train po ako ng chief ko* during the process of—

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. So, continuing training?

Mr. Calilung. Yes *po*, *kasi nagpe-present po ako sa kanila*.

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. *At saan iyong training na sinabi mong dalawang linggo, nabanggit mo ba?*

Mr. Calilung. *Sa office namin siya ginawa, pero ang nag-handle is MaxCor po*.

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. *Ano iyong MaxCor?*

Mr. Calilung. Maxcor Interventures.

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. *Ano nga iyon?*

Mr. Calilung. Provider *po namin* *ng forensic softwares*.

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. *At kompanya siya?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes *po*.

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. *Ng ano? Computer—*

Mr. Calilung. *Ng mga pang-forensic po*.



Senator-Judge Pangilinan. *Pang-forensic*, okay.

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Pangilinan. Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS

(Continuation)

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for Prosecutor, please proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, may I be allowed to speak in Cebuano..., *mahimo ba kita magpadayong?* In Tagalog—it means in English, can we proceed?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Mr. Witness, now, in what particular portion of the subject video did the respondent utter that she already contracted a person to kill the President, the First Lady, and the former Speaker of the House of Representatives?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Are you done? Objection.

Objection, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Can you state the objection, counsel for respondent?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, the question is misleading. There is no mention anywhere before that that the video mentions the killing of the President.

Mr. Ligutan. To kill.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yeah, there's no mention in any testimony earlier. There's no mention that that video—

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, again, with all respect, the record will bear me out, basis have been more than complied with. This witness mentioned many times over that the subject of the investigation is the statement of the Vice President that she already contracted a person to kill the President, the First Lady, and the former Speaker. There's no basis for the objection, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I ask for a readback? He was the only party who said that, Your Honor, not the—

The Presiding Officer. Kindly use the third party in referring to the opposing counsel?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. If I may, Your Honor—

Mr. Narvasa (C). May I ask, Your Honor, for a readback?

The Presiding Officer. Let the counsel for defense finish his statement.

Mr. Narvasa (C). May I ask, Your Honor, for a reading of the transcript as the witness, to my recollection, never mentioned the Vice President did those things?

Mr. Ligutan. All right. If I may, Your Honor—

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, kindly lay the basis.

Mr. Ligutan. Yes, Your Honor, please.

Now, Mr. Witness, you said that your office, the NBI, conducted an investigation for a statement made by the Vice President noong Nobyembre 23, taong 2024, naalala mo iyon?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. What is the basis of the objection?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, it is leading.

Your Honor, please. If I may, Your Honor, please, do you remember—leading, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. If I may, Your Honor, please, I'm just giving in to what the defense wants. The record would bear me out. This witness mentioned so many times over that he investigated the statement of the Vice President uttering that she already contracted a person. The whole nation is listening.

The Presiding Officer. The chair will make a ruling.

Mr. Narvasa (C). So many words leading.

The Presiding Officer. The chair will make a ruling. The objection is overruled. Earlier, Chair noted, I have it in my notes. The question was propounded by counsel with respect to the 11/23/24 incident that was the subject matter of a digital forensic examination by the witness pertaining to the former Vice President. That was the instance, if counsel will recall. That counsel for the prosecutors asked the witness if he knew who the Vice President was. So, the objection is overruled. Witness may answer.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I state for the record, my objection is on the part of the question where he said that the Vice President hired someone to kill the President, the First Lady, and the Speaker of the House. Not on the identification of the Vice President.

The Presiding Officer. Noted. Court already made a ruling. Witness will answer.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, *naalala mo ba iyong tanong?*

Mr. Calilung. Can you repeat the question?

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now—

The Presiding Officer. Can you repeat the question, counsel?

Mr. Ligutan. In what particular portion of the subject video in that online media conference of the Vice President did she utter that she already contracted a person to kill the President, the First Lady, and the former Speaker? In what portion?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. What is the objection?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, this Honorable Court already ruled on this question. The discussion later on was on the leading question made by the prosecutor. If you recall, Your Honor, this Honorable Court said prosecutor, please lay the foundation, the basis for your question.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, if I may, the—

The Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer will ask the witness.

Mr. Witness, out of the two or more so hours of video that you downloaded, do you know, if at all, the timestamp that pertains to any statements made by the Vice President pertaining to any of the allegations in the articles of impeachment, particularly Article 4, the subject matter of this case, in relation to alleged threats made by her in that video?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor, but may I refer to my investigator's note, Your Honor?

The Presiding Officer. You may do so.

Senator Cayetano is recognized.

INQUIRY OF SENATOR-JUDGE CAYETANO (A)

Senator-Judge Cayetano (A) sought clarification on whether the witness had previously testified that the respondent made the alleged threats against the President, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the First Lady.

He observed that, if this was the first reference to the alleged threats, the proper procedure was to first lay the foundation by allowing the witness to identify the contents of the video before being asked about specific statements, in order to avoid leading questions and ensure compliance with the *Rules*.

The Presiding Officer directed counsel to lay the proper foundation by having the witness identify the relevant portions of the two-hour video, including the corresponding timestamps, before proceeding with further questioning.

Attorney Ligutan agreed to proceed accordingly.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS

(Continuation)

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for prosecutors may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. This will be quick.

Mr. Witness, you said that your office conducted an investigation on the statement made by the vice president dated November 23, 2024, correct?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, your honor, leading.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor—

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, on direct, he—

The Presiding Officer. Overruled. Witness may answer.

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *tanong, ano ba, ano exactly iyong sinabi ng vice president noong araw na iyan*, November 23, 2024?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. Why I am not yet done. What is—

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, the process of the prosecution is very confusing.

The Presiding Officer. Kindly let the counsel for the prosecution finish his question before you object?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Precisely, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the prosecution may proceed.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Instead of this, Your Honor, may I ask that the Honorable Court direct the witness to allow me to object before answering.

The Presiding Officer. No.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Because, precisely, the questioning of the prosecutor is there are many pauses. It is confusing if he is done or not.

The Presiding Officer. Witness, even on occasion, forgot what the question was, because he did not respond to the question of the prosecutor.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. make sure of that.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. So, kindly finish your question, if you want to state it again, counsel for the prosecution.

Mr. Ligutan. Maybe it is the tone. I will be quick.

What particular statements of the Vice President on that day did you investigate?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor. Vague.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for respondent, a bit of patience. Let the counsel finish. I do not think he's finished.

Mr. Ligutan. The question is done. What particular statements on that day did you investigate? How was the meeting?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor. Vague

Mr. Ligutan. How is that leading?

Mr. Narvasa (C). I did not say "leading."

The Presiding Officer. Counsel what is the basis of the objection?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Vague.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. I will indulge, Your Honor, please.

I will indulge. I will add these two phrases. It will never be that.

Now, Mr. Witness, what statements did the Vice President utter on that day, if any?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, same objection. There is a 2-hour, 26-minute.

Mr. Ligutan. Let the witness answer.

The Presiding Officer. Counsels, these 2-hour and so minute video was done on the same day.

Mr. Ligutan. Yes.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Correct, Your Honor. But the question must be given with particularity.

The Presiding Officer. If the witness knows. Witness may answer.

Mr. Calilung. Can I refer for my notes to identify the exact statement? Because I might said a statement that is not part of the actual statement.

The Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer will allow the witness to refer to his notes to refresh his memory.

Go ahead, Mr. Witness.

Mr. Calilung. The specific statement: "Yes. *Huwag kang mag-alala, Ma'am, sa security ko kasi may kinausap na ako na tao. Sinabi ko sa kanya kapag pinatay ako, patayin mo ang si BBM, si Liza Araneta, at si Martin Romualdez.* No joke. No joke. *Nagbilin na ako, Ma'am. Pag namatay ako, sabi ko, huwag kang tumigil hangga't di mo sila mapatay.*" And then, he said, "Yes".

The Presiding Officer. Please proceed, counsel.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you.

Now, in what particular portion of that video recording that you authenticated on that online media briefing on November 23, 2024, did the Vice President utter those words?

"*Huwag kang mag-alala, Ma'am, sa security ko kasi may kinausap na ako na tao, at sinabi ko sa kanya na kapag pinatay ako, patayin mo si BBM, si Liza Marcos, si Martin Romualdez.*"

Mr. Calilung. If I may, Sir, I think we should the question first. It starts at 1 hour and 15 minutes to 1 hour 17 minutes and 18 seconds, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, so the witness manifested as an answer to the question: in what portion, he said, timestamps: 1 hour 15 minutes 0 seconds to 1 hour 17 minutes 18 seconds. And we computed, Your Honor, please, it's a 2-minute 18-second portion of that video.

At this juncture, Your Honor, please, basis have been laid, the nation can finally see it. The Court will do. We remove that that 2-minute and 18-second portion of that video be presented at this juncture, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. The Secretariat is instructed to play the USB given to the tech behind that was observed and witnessed by both counsels for the parties.

So ordered. Kindly play the video.

At this juncture, a video presentation was shown.

Voice. Vice President, thank you so much *nga po pala sa dala ninyong hopya noong hearing na pumunta kayo* for PRRD. *Kami iyong nasa likod niyo po, iyong tinawag nilang bastos kasi ...inaudible*

The Presiding Officer. Kindly pause it.

Ganiyan ba talaga?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, can I?

Your Honor, please, the witness said that he would like to include that question propounded to the Vice President.

The Presiding Officer. So, *ganiyan nga. Hindi na lalakihan iyan? Ganiyan na talaga iyan?* Or it will get bigger, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. All right. Please proceed.

Continuation of the video presentation

Voice. ...*Nakakain kami eh. Ako po ay natatakot kumain ng pagkain doon baka mamaya eh.*

Ma'am, mag-iingat po kayo. Nasa teritoryo po kayo ng kalaban. Uh, nag-aalala po kami po kami para sa iyo."

Vice President Duterte. *Ma'am, kasi sila naman ang nauna eh. Sila talaga ang bastos eh.* You read what you saw.

Voice. Yeah. *Mag-iingat po kayo. Kasi sa dinami-rami po ng inyong mga pasabog ngayong gabi, it seems like marami po talaga kayong alam about them, no, Uh, dahil sa pagkakasama niyo sa kanila during the campaign and during that elections. Baka po mamaya kasi totoo yung mga naririnig namin, or yung—I don't know if it's true—na meron daw silang operation Romanovs, and baka balak kayong ubusin, ang inyong pamilya, dahil hadlang kayo sa kanilang mga balak in the future.*

So mag-iingat po kayo. Kami po kasi ng EDSA Friday group, kami yung bumababa every Friday diyan sa EDSA because we believe iyan ang tamang venue. Sa dinami-rami na ng problema natin, ang kaya lang naman po naming gawin ay manawagan na bumaba na iyan. Eh ano po kaya ang remedy naman ninyong mga nasa posisyon or ng mga kayang labanan itong napakarami na pong ginagawang corruption at krimen laban sa taong bayan? Ano po ang puwede ninyong maging remedy para matapos na ito, lalo't nagsisigaw na po ang taong bayan na mag-people power na?

Vice President Duterte. "Yes. *Huwag kang mag-alala, Ma'am, sa security ko. Kasi may kinausap na ako na tao. Sinabi ko sa kanya, 'Kapag pinatay ako, patayin mo si BBM, si Liza Araneta, at si Martin Romualdez.' No joke. No joke. Nagbilin na ako, Ma'am. 'Pag namatay ako,' sabi ko, 'huwag kang tumigil hanggang hindi mo mapatay sila.' And then he said, "Yes."*

Mr. Ligutan. That is the end of that 2-minute and 18-second portion of the video, Your Honor, please.

Pwede ba kitang magpadayod? Can we continue?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel may continue. You may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, Mr. Witness, what relation, if any, does that video that you viewed with the video you mentioned earlier of the Vice President uttering that statements?

Mr. Calilung. It is the portion of the video that I authenticated, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay.

Let us continue. What happened next, Mr. Witness, *kung meron man*, after *mong ma-authenticate ang subject video na iyan*?

Mr. Calilung. Our team conducted an open source investigation to identify previous statement of the Vice President that had similarities to the November 23, 2024 video, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, *sinabi mo* that your team conducted *iyong tinatawag mong* open-source investigation for any prior statements made by the Vice President against President Marcos Jr. and his family members. *Iyong tanong nga, bakit kailangan pa mag-conduct ng* open-source investigation for any prior statements *na ginawa, kung meron man, ng* Vice President *laban kay* President Marcos Jr. *tsaka yung pamilya niya*?

Mr. Calilung. As part of our standard procedure, Sir, *kailangan naming makita iyong* full context *kung bakit ito nagsimula. Kaya nagtingin kami ng mga* prior statement made by the Vice President against the President and the family.

Mr. Ligutan. All right.

Now, *ano ba yung naging resulta, kung meron man, sa naging* open-source investigation *ninyo, Mr. Witness*?

Mr. Calilung. We identified a video, October 18, 2024, an online press conference held by the office of the Vice President, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *ano ba yung nakita niyo, kung meron man, sa naging* press conference *ng* Vice President on October 18, 2024?

Mr. Calilung. There were similar statements uttered by the Vice President against the President, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. So, *sinasabi mo na* on that October 18, 2024, press conference, *may mga nasabi din na mga* statements *ang* *bise-presidente laban sa* President. *Iyon ba sinasabi mo, di ba*?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *ang tanong is, ano ba iyong naging mga parehong* statements *ng* Vice President *sa araw na yan, October 18, 2024*?

Mr. Calilung. To say the exact statement, may I refer to my investigator's notes, sir?

Mr. Ligutan. Move, Your Honor, that this witness be allowed to peruse his notes to answer the question as to *ano ba iyong naging* exact statements *ng* Vice President on October 18, 2024. Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Witness may confer with his notes.

Mr. Calilung. "*Gusto ko tanggalin iyong ulo niya ba. I just imagine myself cutting his head.*"

Mr. Ligutan. So, *sinabi ng* Vice President, "*Gusto kong tanggalin ang ulo niya. I imagine myself cutting his head.*" Now, *ano pa iyong naging* statement, *kung meron pa*?

Mr. Calilung. "*So, doon na-realize ko toxic na, hindi ba? Ganiyan na iyong imagination mo, sinasakal mo na iyong tao. And then I said, 'This is over.'*"

Mr. Ligutan. All right. *Kung meron pa, ano pa iyong naging* statement *ng* Vice President *sa araw na iyan*?

Mr. Calilung. "*Hindi marunong maging presidente ang nakaupo. Kasalanan ko ba iyon?*"

Mr. Ligutan. *Kung meron pa, ano pa iyong naging* statement *ng* Bise Presidente *sa araw na iyan*?

Mr. Calilung. "*Hindi ko alam pero isang beses sinabihan ko talaga si Senator Imee. Sabi ko sa kaniya, 'Kung hindi kayo tumigil, huhukayin ko iyang tatay n'yo. Itatapon ko siya sa West Philippine Sea.'*"



Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please. There is a manifestation of the good Sen. "Tito" Sotto. He did not hear the last statement.

The Presiding Officer. No such manifestation was heard by the Presiding Officer. Council may continue. Please proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

The Presiding Officer. Kindly state it for the record. Senator-Judge Sotto, apologies from the Presiding Officer.

Senator-Judge Sotto. Thank you. I did not get the exact words that were uttered during the last statement.

The Presiding Officer. Will the witness kindly repeat his answer to the last question propounded by counsel for the prosecutors?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor. "*Hindi ko alam pero isang beses sinabihan ko talaga si Senator Imee. Sabi ko sa kaniya, "Kung hindi kayo tumigil, huhukayin ko iyang tatay n'yo. Itatapon ko siya sa West Philippine Sea."*"

Mr. Ligutan. May I proceed, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ano pa iyong naging mga statements, kung meron pa, ng Bise Presidente sa araw na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Last statement. "*Kung presidente n'yo siya, okay lang. Ako, hanggang vice president lang ako. Hanggang number two lang itong bansa na ito. Wala itong number one para sa akin.*"

Mr. Ligutan. Are these all the statements, Mr. Witness?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, proceed. Now, *ano pa iyong nangyare, kung meron man, pagkatapos madiskubre ng NBI iyong mga naging statements ng Vice President noong araw na iyan, October 18, 2024?*

Mr. Calilung. Like what we did to the main video, the November 23, I proceed to preserve and authenticate the October 18, 2024 video, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Again, *ano ba iyong ibig sabihin* when you preserve the video?

Mr. Calilung. It means that I make the necessary reaction to ensure that the evidence will be accessible at any time, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. Now, *ano ba iyong ibig sabihin* after *mong ma-authenticate* *iyong* video? *Ano ba iyong ginawa mo, kung meron pa?*

Mr. Calilung. I saved the video on my laptop and on a flash drive, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *sinabi mo iyong flash drive kung saan sineyb (save) mo iyong mga video* recording *mo sa mga naging statements ng Bise Presidente sa araw na iyan.* Now, *kung iyong flash drive na iyan ipapakita sa iyo, maa-identify mo ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please. We are now in the process of confronting this witness with a flash drive that is previously marked as Exhibit P14-11a for the prosecution containing the recording of the October 18, 2024 press-conference of the Vice President identified by the witness that is previously marked as Exhibit P-4-11 for the prosecution.

Mr. Calilung. Permission to unseal the flash drive.

The Presiding Officer. You may do so.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. Manifestation, Your Honor, that the witness is in the process of checking the flash drive. Question, Mr. Witness, what relation, if any, does that flash drive have with the flash drive you mentioned?



Mr. Calilung. This is the flash drive where I saved the recording, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. Now, Mr. Witness, you mentioned earlier that you authenticated the subject video by recording the same through open broadcaster software, and then you compared the contents of the recording of subject video, and you also said that you found out that the respondent said, *ito ang sinabi niya*, "*Gusto kong tanggalin iyong ulo niya.*" At saka, "I imagine myself cutting his head." Do you follow?

Mr. Calilung. Yes.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, Mr. Witness, in what particular portion of that subject video did the Vice President utter "*Gusto kong tanggalin iyong ulo niya.* I imagine myself cutting his head."?

Mr. Calilung. Permission to refer back to my investigator's note, sir.

The Presiding Officer. Witness may do so.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I approach the witness?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel may do so.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

Mr. Calilung. For the first statement, timestamp 01:35:57 to 01:36:10. And on the part na "I just imagine myself...", 01:36:52 to 01:36:58, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, what about the statement that *sinabi niya*, "So, *doon na-realize ko toxic na, hindi ba? Ganiyan na iyong imagination mo, sinasakal mo na iyong tao.* And then I said, "This is over." In what particular portion of the video did the Vice President utter that statements?

Mr. Calilung. The authenticated video timestamp 01:38:32 to 01:38:48, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, what about the statement "*Hindi marunong maging presidente ang nakaupo. Kasalanan ko ba iyon?*" In what particular portion of the subject video did the Vice President utter that?

Mr. Calilung. Timestamp 00:55:26 to timestamp 00:55:37, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, what about the statement that I quote, "*Hindi ko alam. Isang beses sinabihan ko talaga si Senator Imee, pag di tumigil, huhukayin ko ang tatay n'yo at itatapon ko siya sa West Philippine Sea.*" In what particular portion of the video did the Vice President utter those words?

Mr. Calilung. Timestamp 01:11:28 to 01:11:42, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And finally, as to the statements, I quote, "*Kung presidente n'yo siya, okay lang. Ako hanggang vice president lang ako. Hanggang number two lang itong bansang ito. Wala itong number one para sa akin.*" In what particular portion of that video did the Vice President utter those words?

Mr. Calilung. On timestamp 01:04:02 to 01:04:16.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, this representation took notes of the timestamp. So, Your Honor, please, we go to the next question.

Now, Mr. Witness, I am about to show you the specific portions of the recording of the October 18, 2024 press-conference. Now, you tell us, after viewing these portions, what relations do they have with the subject video of that October 18, 2024 video that you identified, if any. Okay?

Now, Your Honor, we move that Atty. Stephen Magallon be allowed to proceed to the technical booth to bring the flash drive and for the Secretariat to play specific portions of the video identified by the witness.

The Presiding Officer. Condition, upon counsel, being accompanied by a representative of the counsel for the respondent so that the exact same USB flash drive will be the one that will be played.



Mr. Ligutan. To guide the Secretariat, Your Honor, please. These are the timestamps that the prosecution would like to present. First, from 01:35:57 to 01:36:10 at the first video; and the second video is from 01:36:52 to 01:36:58. So move, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. The Secretariat is instructed to kindly play the video in the presence of both counsels for the parties.

(Video Presentation) Vice President Duterte: "*Gusto ko tanggalin ang ulo niya ba. I realized—*"

Mr. Ligutan. And the second video, please. Timestamp is 01:36:52 to 01:36:58, please.

(Video Presentation) Vice President Duterte: "*Cutting his head. Ganoon din ang gusto ko.*"

Mr. Witness, you heard the Vice President mentioning cutting somebody else's head. Based on your investigation, *kaninong ulo ba iyong nire-refer ng Vice President na gusto niyang tanggalin?*

Mr. Calilung. The President, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ulo ng Presidente.*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. President, you also mentioned timestamps 01:38:32 and 01:38:48. May we have that specific portion be played?

(Video Presentation) Vice President Duterte: "*So na-realize ko. Toxic na, di ba? Ganyan na yung—ganyan na yung imagination mo. Ang imagination mo sinasakal mo na yung tao. And then I said, "This is over."*"

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Then what about from timestamps 00:55:26 to 00:55:37, please?

(Video Presentation) Vice President Duterte: "*Hindi marunong maging presidente ang nakapupo. Kasalanan ko ba yun? Hindi. Bakit sinasabi ng mga tao, "kasalanan mo kasi hindi ka tumakbo?" Ikaw sana yung presidente, hindi siya. And then I said, "Maaga akong nagsabi na hindi ako tatakbo for President. May mga—madaming mga—"*"

Okay. Now, what about from timestamps 01:11:28 to 01:11:42?

(Video Presentation) Vice President Duterte: "*Hindi ko alam. Pero nung isang beses sinabihan ko talaga si Senator Imee. Sabi ko sa kaniya, kung hindi kayo tumigil, huhukayin ko 'yang tatay ninyo. Itatapon ko siya sa West Philippine Sea. Sinabihan ko si Senator Imee.*"

Thank you. What about from timestamps 01:04:02 to 01:04:16?

(Video Presentation) Vice President Duterte: "*Ay, no. Hindi. Hindi ko na gusto. Kung presidente niyo siya, okay lang. Ako, hanggang vice president lang ako. Hanggang number two lang itong bansa na ito. Wala itong number one para sa akin.*"

Okay. We proceed, Your Honor. Mr. Witness, what relation, if any, do these portions of that specific video have with the video you authenticated as to the press conference of the Vice President on October 18, 2023?

Mr. Calilung. Those videos presented were portions of the video that I recorded and authenticated, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much. Mr. Witness, *ano ba iyong nangyari, kung mayroon pa, after you authenticated—identified and authenticated the video ng Vice President on October 18, 2024?*

Mr. Calilung. We performed open source investigation to identify *naman po iyong mga naging responses ng iba't ibang tao* in response to the statement of the Vice President po.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ano ba iyong naging resulta, kung mayroon man, sa naging open source investigation ninyo?*

Mr. Calilung. We found that the President himself, the former Speaker of the House, and

different governmental agencies made their statements po in response to the statement of the Vice President.

Mr. Ligutan. So, *iyong Presidente, iyong* former Speaker of the House, *saka iyong mga sinasabi mong mga* governmental agencies, *nagbigay ng kanilang mga tugon sa mga nasabi ng* Vice President. Now, *ano ba iyong mga* governmental agencies *na ito* that you are referring to, aside from the President and the former Speaker of the House of Representatives?

Mr. Calilung. The Armed Forces of the Philippines, the Philippine National Police, the National Security Council, and the Presidential Communication Office, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, *nasabi mo na iyong Presidente ay nag-issue ng kaniyang* statement in relation *sa mga naging mga pahayag ng* Vice President. *Ano ba iyong naging pruwera mo sa naging* statement *ng Presidente?*

Mr. Calilung. I have taken a screenshot of the statement of the President on the official web page of the Presidential Communications Office. And I also have a video recording—which I authenticated—wherein the President made such a statement, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. So, *nasabi mo, isang screenshot saka isang* authenticated recording *ng Presidente.* Now, let's go to that screenshot. *Sino iyong kumuha ng screenshot, kung alam mo?*

Mr. Calilung. I did, sir, and I used my laptop.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ginamit mo iyong laptop mo. Ano ba iyong ginawa mo, kung mayroon man, sa naging* screenshot *mo sa laptop mo?*

Mr. Calilung. I first saved an electronic copy po *noong* screenshot *na iyon.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *saan na itong* screenshot *ng—*

Mr. Calilung. *Pinrint (print) ko po.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *saan na iyong printout ng* screenshot *na ito?*

Mr. Calilung. *Sinabmit (submit) ko po sa* Committee on Justice of House of Representatives.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *kung iyong printout ng naging* statement *ng Presidente na sinabi mo* titled "Message by President Ferdinand R. Marcos Jr." is shown to you, will you be able to identify the same?

Mr. Calilung. Yes *po.*

Mr. Ligutan. I'm showing you now a printout of a screenshot of the statement from the President titled "Message from President Ferdinand R. Marcos Jr." Your Honor, that is previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-12 for the prosecution through the website of the Presidential Communications Office.

Now, question: What relation, if any, does this document have with the printout that you mentioned?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, same objections to this printout.

Mr. Ligutan. May I know the specific objections?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, same objections. There is on the left-right bottom portion of the Annex I, Annex P-U-12, 12A, and until 12B. There is—there are marked certified true copies from the NBI signed Safira T. dated 4/10/2026, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. The Court made a previous ruling about this matter already, but the objection is duly noted.

Mr. Narvasa (C). We submit, Your Honor. Thank you.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, how faithful, please—how faithful, if at all, is this printout from the actual screenshots?

Mr. Calilung. The printouts accurately reflects the screenshot, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And how do you know that this printout accurately reflects the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. I compared the printouts with the screenshot and the web page wherein the message can be seen, and found that the contents are identical, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, you mentioned that an authenticated recording of the President making a statement that you mentioned that now, *iyong* question now is, *sino ba iyong gumawa ng authentication na ito?*

Mr. Calilung. I did, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ano ba iyong pruwera mo na ikaw talaga iyong nag-authenticate ng video na ito?*

Mr. Calilung. It is part of the January 30 Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence *na* na-identify *ko po* kanina.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay, Mr. Wintess, *ano ba ang ginawa mo, kung mayroon man, pagkatapos mo sinabi mong ni-record mo at na-authenticate mo iyong video ng President na nagbibigay ng statement niya.*

Mr. Calilung. *Na-save ko po iyong video sa laptop ko at sa flash drive.*

Mr. Ligutan. *Na-mention mo iyong flash drive. Now, kung iyong flash drive ay ipapakita sa iyo, maa-identify mo ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes po.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, Your Honor, please, we are in the process of confronting this witness ng isang flash drive that is previously marked for the prosecution as Exhibit P-IV-13a.

Mr. Calilung. Permission to unseal the flash drive, sir.

The Presiding Officer. Witness may do so.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. Continuing manifestation that the flash drive contains the recording of the President making a statement that is previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-13 for the prosecution.

Mr. Calilung. This is the flash drive where I saved the recording, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay, now. Move that we allow Atty. Steven Magallon to proceed to the technical booth to have the recording played, Your Honor, please, to be accompanied by the defense if they want to.

The Presiding Officer. So ordered.

(Video Presentation)

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, the defense puts on record that the video was skipping and then portions where the President—or who seemed to be the President—was paused while audio was continuing playing.

The Presiding Officer. So it's delayed.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Noted.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you.

Mr. Witness, what relation, if any, does that video have, have the President making the statement, if any, to the video the President making the statement?

Mr. Calilung. That is the video that I recorded and authenticated, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. Now, proceed.

You mentioned that the Presidential Communications Office (PCO) also issued a statement. *Ano iyong pruwera mo na iyong PCO ang nag-issue ng statement na iyan?*



Mr. Calilung. I have a screenshot of the web page of the Presidential Communications Office wherein they considered the statement of the Vice-President as an active threat.

Mr. Ligutan. As an active threat. Okay. Now, *sino iyong kumuha ng screenshot na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. I did, sir, and I used my laptop.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *saan iyong printout ng screenshot na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Na-submit ko po sa Committee on Justice sa House of Representatives.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *aming ipinapakita iyong isang printout ng isang screenshot na galing sa website ng PCO kung saan iyong statement, makikita iyong statement ng Vice-President, sinasabi ng PCO, "That's an active threat." now previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-14. May you peruse the same. And after perusing the same, the question na Mr. Calilung is what relation, if any, does this document have with the penultementia but you have to peruse the document first.*

Mr. Narvasa (C). For the record again, Your Honor, the—

The Presiding Officer. Counsel proceeds.

Mr. Narvasa (C). —the Exhibit P-IV-14 is a photocopy, and on the right bottom part, there is a stamp marked "Certified True Copy", NBI signed Safira T., dated 4/10/2026.

The Presiding Officer. The observations and comments of the respondent's counsel are duly noted.

Witness, may I answer.

Mr. Ligutan. Please peruse the document and answer the question, please.

Mr. Calilung. This is the copy of the printout that was submitted to the Committee on Justice, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

How faithful, if at all, is this printout from the actual screenshot you mentioned?

Mr. Calilung. The printout accurately reflects the screenshot, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And how do you know that the printout accurately reflects the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. I have compared the screenshot with the printout and the web page, and found that the contents are identical.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, let's proceed.

Mr. Witness, *sinabi mo rin na iyong former Speaker ng House of Representatives, nagbigay rin ng statement sa mga pagbabanta ni VP Duterte sa isang video. Ano ba iyong maging pruwera mo sa naging pahayag ng former Speaker ng House of Representatives?*

Mr. Calilung. I have a video of the statement of the former Speaker of the House of Representatives during the plenary session on November 25, 2024, which was published by ANC Digitals.

Mr. Ligutan. *At sinabi mo na na-authenticate mo iyong video na iyon. Ano ba iyong naging pruwera mo na ikaw ay nag-authenticate sa video na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. It's part of the affidavit of authentication of digital evidence dated January 30, 2025, which I identified earlier, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *ano ba iyong ginawa mo, kung mayroon man, after you authenticated iyong video ng former Speaker of the House of Representatives?*

Mr. Calilung. I saved a copy of the video on my laptop, and a copy of the video on a DVD and a flash drive.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *sinabi mo sinave mo sa isang flash drive. Kung iyong flash drive na iyan ipapakita sa iyo, maa-identify mo ba iyong flash drive na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, we are in the process of presenting to the witness, *iyong isang* flash drive that has been previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-15a, which contains the recording of the former Speaker's speech previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-15.

Mr. Calilung. Permission to unseal the flash drive, sir.

The Presiding Officer. Witness may proceed.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. Manifestation, the witness is in the process of checking that flash drive.

Mr. Calilung. This is the flash drive where I saved the recording, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, in what particular portion of that video did the former Speaker of the House give his response to the threats of the Vice President?

Mr. Calilung. May I refer back to my notes?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please. There is a request by the witness that he be allowed to refer to his notes.

The Presiding Officer. Yes, the witness may refer to his notes to refresh his memory.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (E). Mr. Presiding Officer.

The Presiding Officer. What is the pleasure of Senator-Judge Erwin Tulfo?

CLARIFICATORY QUESTION OF SENATOR-JUDGE TULFO (E)

Senator-Judge Tulfo (E). Mr. Presiding Officer, just a clarificatory question.

The Presiding Officer. To the witness.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (E). The witness here, for the record, mentioned that he was referring to notes, *kanina pa po ito*. Could you please clarify what specific notes he was referring to? Who prepared those notes? When were they prepared? And were they made before, during, or after the events he had testified about? And also, these notes, *nabigyan po ba ang defense ng copy nito*? Was this submitted as part of the evidence also, Mr. Presiding Officer?

Additionally, the question is, was he relying on these notes to refresh his recollection while giving his testimony today?

The Presiding Officer. Witness, will you please answer the question of Senator-Judge Erwin Tulfo.

Mr. Calilung. This is my investigator's notes, which I made during my time of investigation, sir.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (E). My next question will be, was this also presented? Since notes *niyo po ito*, *pinagbabasehan niyo po iyong mga testimonya niyo rito*, *sinubmit niyo rin po ba ito* as an evidence so that *may mare-refer din po ang defense*, Mr. Witness?

Mr. Calilung. *Iyong content po ng notes ko is nandoon na po sa Affidavit of Investigation*, sir.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (E). *Pero iyong copy exactly, ng—*

Mr. Calilung. *Ng notes po, no, sir.*

Senator-Judge Tulfo (E). *Hindi niyo naibigay?*

That is all, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Thank you, Senator-Judge Erwin Tulfo.

Counsel, for the prosecution—

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS*(Continuation)*

Mr. Ligutan. Can I make a manifestation, Your Honor, please, that the witness referred to his notes when answering specific questions as to actual statements made by the Vice-President and the others, number one; and number two, in referring to the actual timestamps of the video for this specific reasons, the witness was referring to his notes as to his answers for the others substantial questions he was not referring to his notes, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, we move to strike the manifestation. He is already testifying on behalf of the witness.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, we cannot move to strike a manifestation of counsel. The good counsel could do his own manifestation. That is not in the rules.

Mr. Narvasa (C). I would like the Honorable Court to rule, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Motion is denied. Let it stay and remain in the records in response to the query of Senator-Judge Erwin Tulfo.

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. Mr. Presiding Officer.

The Presiding Officer. Senator-Judge Risa Hontiveros is recognized. I believe she was raising her hand earlier. What is your pleasure, ma'am?

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. *Salamat po*, Mr. Presiding Officer. *Tig-isang tanong lamang po para sa witness at para sa prosecution.*

The Presiding Officer. The lady may proceed. She has two minutes.

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR-JUDGE HONTIVEROS

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. *Salamat*. Mr. Presiding Officer.

Mr. Calilung, *noong sinabi niyo na nag-conduct kayo ng open source intelligence pagkatapos niyo ma-authenticate iyong November 23, 2024 video, at nahanap ninyo iyong video naman ng press conference dated October 18, 2024, anong basis ninyo para sabihin na iyong mga statements sa October 18 press conference ay kahalintulad sa November 23 video na may assassination threat?*

In other words *po*, *ano pong napansin ninyong magkakapareho doon sa statements noong October 18 at noong November 23? Or, what do they have in common?*

Mr. Calilung. Both were, *ang tinutukoy po at pinupunto po is iyong President. And makikita po doon na hindi na sila in good terms noong October 18 pa lang po.*

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. Okay. So, *sa parehong video ng press conference at saka iyong November video naman, iyong dalawang elementong iyon na hindi na sila magkakasundo, at?*

Mr. Calilung. *Hindi na sila magkasundo, and ang ina-address po ng— ang parang pinapatukuyan po ng Vice-President doon sa press conference is iyong President.*

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. Okay. Mr. Presiding Officer, *salamat kay Mr. Calilung.*

Sa prosecution naman po, iyong isang tanong ko, at this point in time, Mr. Presiding Officer. Well, counsel, none of these statements are proof that the Vice- President actually contacted an assassin, or hired one.

Why are these acts impeachable?

Mr. Ligutan. There is an answer to that question, Your Honor, please.

The prosecution is in the process of establishing that the Vice-President should be impeached, and she is impeached, and be removed from office for contracting an assassin to kill the President, Your Honor, please.

In as much as we understand that this statement may not actually 100% prove that she in fact contracted an assassin to kill the President, Your Honor, please, we are invoking a rule in the Rules of Evidence that there could be statements, utterances of a person that may not be directly similar to what he or she did but it could establish, Your Honor, please, what we call a specific intent, knowledge, identity, plan, system, and the like. *Ibig sabihin po, pinapakita ng prosecution na iyong mga nasabi ng Vice-President sa gabing iyon, November 23, 2024, hindi po iyan nag-iisang statement ng Vice-President. Kung hindi, iyon po iyong culmination sa mga series of statements ng Vice-President kung saan sinasabi niya talagang gusto niyang patayin iyong Presidente, iyong First Lady, at saka iyong former Speaker of the House, Your Honor, please.*

We invoke Rule 130, Your Honor, please, Section 35 of the Rules of Court. *Itong mga statements na ito, they prove one thing: talagang may plano na, talagang may system na, talagang may knowledge na iyong Vice-President sa anong gusto niyang gawin sa Pangulo: gusto niyang pugutan ng ulo; gusto niyang patayin.* No less than the President of the Republic of the Philippines, Your Honor, please.

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. *At ang tanong po ba dito ay, kung may krimen, o kung ang asal ay karapat-dapat sa Vice-Presidente.*

Mr. Ligutan. Yes, Your Honor please.

We are able to answer two questions, Your Honor, please. The charges against the Vice-President, *iyong pagbe-betray ng public trust*, Your Honor, please. That is also a culpable violation of the Constitution.

Now, *iyong usapin* was that a criminal act? Yes, Your Honor, please. *Kaya nga iyong NBI, through this witness, will prove na nag-file na, nag-file na ng kaso iyong NBI against the Vice-President, exactly sa mga naging pagbabanta niya.*

But you know, Your Honor, I am a lawyer, but I'm willing, willing to take off *iyong* role *ko* as a lawyer and answer that question directly.

Mga kababayan, kailan ba naging normal—

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, this is no longer answering the question—

Mr. Ligutan. No, Your Honor, please. I am answering the question—

Mr. Narvasa (C). —We object.

The Presiding Officer. The Chair will make an equitable ruling in a while. Kindly let the gentleman finish, because it's a senator-judge asking a question of a party.

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

Mr. Ligutan. *Kailan ba nangyari sa kasaysayan ng Republika ng Pilipinas na iyong Pangalawang Pangulo ng ating bansa, nagbanta, sinabi sa publiko na nakipagkontrata na siya sa isang mamamatay-tao upang patayin ang Pangulo, ang First Lady— iyong asawa niya?*

Your Honor, please, I think Attorney Sison is making a scene—

The Presiding Officer. Kindly wind up, Counsel.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, manifestation. I think Attorney Sison gave a statement addressed to this representation, and she walked out. She's now coming back.

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. Mr. Presiding Officer—

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, kindly wind up, and we will address that matter in a bit.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, Your Honor, please, *iyong pagbabanta ng Bise Presidente sa buhay ng Pangulo ng Republika ng Pilipinas, hindi po iyan normal. Iyan po ay unang pagkakataon na nangyari iyan. Nakipagkontrata sa isang mamamatay-tao to do that.* Even without going into the question, is that a criminal act? That act, 110% sure, betrayed the public trust that the Vice-President got in the previous elections.

The Presiding Officer. Thank you. Thank you, Counsel for the Opposition.



Senator-Judge Hontiveros. *Salamat*, Counsel; *Salamat*, Mr. Calilung; *Salamat*, Mr. Presiding Officer.

The Presiding Officer. The Chair would like to remind my colleagues. The question posed by Senator-Judge Risa pertains to the final question of these entire impeachment proceedings already: if that is an impeachable act or not?

And since we gave the Counsel for the Prosecutors, I think, about five minutes, the Chair would now like to be fair and hear the Counsel for the Respondent to discuss why it is not an impeachable offense.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I be allowed to do so after our cross?

The Presiding Officer. After your—

Mr. Narvasa (C). I would like the—as I understand it, I would like the Honorable Court to play back what the Prosecutor said, because it's very interesting. So, may I be indulged to allow to give my answer after my cross-examination?

The Presiding Officer. The Chair will allow it.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. But you would have the similar and same amount of time given to the Counsel for the Prosecutors, again, to answer the reverse of the question—

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. —Because statements were made by the Counsel for the Prosecutor, their conclusions of fact and law already, which should be taken upon advisement by the Impeachment Court, because these were not evidence, but rather conclusions in fact and law by the Counsel for the Prosecutor.

Senator-Judge Pia S. Cayetano is recognized. Ma'am, you may proceed. What's your pleasure?

MANIFESTATION OF SENATOR-JUDGE CAYETANO (P)

Senator-Judge Cayetano (P). Thank you, Mr. President.

I would just like to manifest my support for the statement and observation of the Presiding Officer. That was like a closing statement, Mr. Presiding Officer, so I don't think this is fair, because, you know, some parts are exciting, some parts are dragging. We're trying our best to be paying attention and what evidence, you know, we have to fetch the evidence before us, what is admissible, what is not; the official objections will come later. But when we allow this to happen, *na-shortcut na natin iyong* process.

So, if I may, with all due respect, Mr. President, admonish us, call us out if *iyong* question *natin* is also not proper at a proper time. We may all make those mistakes. Even I may make that mistake. And I'm telling you, please call me out if I make a mistake and ask the kind of question that should not properly be asked by a judge, at that particular time, because it is not right. We must follow the rules. And I know you are being courteous to all of us, but that was a closing statement.

And I also ask the parties involved: you have an oath as lawyers. Don't take advantage of the generosity of this Impeachment Court. I don't want to see this happen again.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The Presiding Officer. Duly noted and well-taken. The Chair, as I said, or as the Presiding Officer said earlier, reminded our colleagues, with respect to similar questions to be asked in the future.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may—

The Presiding Officer. The Chair would like to make a ruling that the Counsel for the Respondent will be given, I think that was approximately eight minutes, or ten minutes, we will get

the exact time, to answer after the cross-examination of this witness, so that we would be fair in listening and hearing the views of both parties in regard to the query raised earlier.

Senator-Judge Pia S. Cayetano?

Senator-Judge Cayetano (P). Yeah, sorry, Mr. Presiding Officer. I don't mean to interrupt. I want to give the Defense their time.

I respectfully move that the statements of the Prosecution be stricken off the record. It is not proper for those statements to have been made. Thank you.

Mr. Ligutan. If I may, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. With the permission of Senator-Judge Pia S. Cayetano, the—

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, we join the motion of the senator-judge.

The Presiding Officer. —may we table her motion and act on it at a later time, with respect to striking it, so that we can discuss the matter.

Thank you for your generosity, Senator-Judge Pia S. Cayetano.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, if I may, for the record—

The Presiding Officer. Yes, Counsel for the Respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). —we join the motion of the Honorable Senator.

The Presiding Officer. I'm sorry?

Mr. Narvasa (C). We join the motion of the Honorable Senator.

The Presiding Officer. No need, Counsel. That motion will be taken up at a proper time by this Court.

Mr. Narvasa (C). For the record *lang*, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Noted for the record.

Senator-Judge Erwin T. Tulfo first, and then Senator-Judge Risa Hontiveros once again.

MANIFESTATION OF SENATOR-JUDGE TULFO (E)

Senator-Judge Tulfo (E). I think, to resolve this issue, Mr. Presiding Officer, a quick manifestation.

Can we request the Counsel that be directed whenever available, to furnish members of this Impeachment Court with sworn statement, testimony, or affidavit of witnesses or witness they intend to present in the proceedings, or succeeding proceedings, before such witness is called to testify? And this goes to the Defense panel too.

While the Judicial Affidavit Rule does not strictly apply to impeachment proceedings, its underlying objectives of promoting orderly and efficient presentation of evidence may be instructive. Advanced access to the witness's sworn statement would assist the senator-judges in following the testimony and preparing clarificatory questions.

Sa madaling sabi po, hinihiling lang po natin na kung mayroon nang nakahandang Sinumpaang Salaysay ng susunod na testigo, magbigay na sana ng mga kopya nito sa aming mga senator-judges bago pa po ang pagdinig, upang magsilbing gabay sa pagtatanong at pagtatalakay, maiwasan po natin ang mga sitwasyon na ito.

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

The Presiding Officer. To reply, Senator-Judge Erwin T. Tulfo, the Court did not adopt the Judicial Affidavit Rule for the simple reason that we wanted all of the testimonies to be made and given in open court, so that it will be heard not only by the senator-judges but also by the public as a whole, given that this is an Impeachment Court and an impeachment trial that seeks to unseat a duly elected official.

However, the Court shall endeavor, through the Clerk of Court, to give the senator-judges a copy of the annexes attached, if they have not yet done so, to the Pre-Trial Order and the Pre-Trial briefs pre-marked by the parties, because it would encompass already approximately 80% of the documents that will be presented by both parties. Same, of course, for documents that they have not yet been able to produce and are yet to produce.

But the Clerk of Court is instructed to endeavor to do so with respect to the senator-judges, so that they can catch up with what is going on in the proceedings.

Yes, Counsel for the Prosecution, you may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much—

MANIFESTATION OF SENATOR-JUDGE HONTIVEROS

The Presiding Officer. Apologies.

Senator-Judge Risa Hontiveros is recognized. What is your pleasure, ma'am?

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. *Salamat po*, Mr. Presiding Officer.

Just a point of clarity, briefly, if I may, Mr. Presiding Officer.

The Presiding Officer. You may proceed, ma'am.

Senator-Judge Hontiveros. *Salamat po*, Mr. Presiding Officer.

And of course, I will submit to any ruling or statement of the Presiding Officer to this senator-judge. But for clarity, Mr. Presiding Officer, my question *po* had to do with how the evidence is material to the allegations in the Articles of Impeachment?

Kasi nga po, hindi naman napapatunayan na the Vice-President actually sought an assassin. I wanted to appreciate the evidence before me in light of the Articles of Impeachment. If you wish to strike out the response of the Prosecutor, then so be it, Mr. Presiding Officer. But for clarity again, my intention was not to provoke a closing statement.

Salamat po, Mr. Presiding Officer.

The Presiding Officer. We will review the transcript. Again, sorry, we have some—my apologies on the part of the Presiding Officer. We have a bit of a problem with respect to getting an updated copy of the TSN.

But given the clarification of Senator-Judge Risa on the matter, then for the consideration of the Body, given that we tabled the motion of Senator Pia, that the response of Counsel for the Prosecution is not responsive to the question of Senator-Judge Hontiveros because, clearly, the question he answered was whether or not it constituted an impeachable offense. But without further debate, we are tabling this, and we'll discuss and decide upon this at a later date.

So ordered.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

May I proceed, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel may proceed.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS

(Continuation)

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, okay, now, *sinabi mo na iyong* former Speaker of the House *ay nagbigay ng kaniyang tugon sa mga naging pagbabanta ng Vice-President, at saka sinabi mo rin na may isang video recording na in-authenticate mo. Iyong tanong is—*Your Honor, please, sorry, I am reminded. He is supposed to answer the specific time stamp of that recording of the former Speaker of the House's speech, Your Honor, please.

I move that the witness be allowed to answer the question as to *ano iyang naging* specific time stamp *ng* recording *na iyan*.

The Presiding Officer. Witness may answer.

Mr. Calilung. May I refer to my investigator's note, sir?

The Presiding Officer. You may do so if you so wish.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.

Time stamp 1 minute, 2 seconds to 2 minutes and 20 seconds.

Mr. Ligutan. So, that would be time stamp 1 minute, 2 seconds to 2 minutes?

Mr. Calilung. Twenty seconds, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Twenty seconds, Your Honor, please.

I move that the portion identified by the witness, from time stamps 1 minute, 2 seconds to 2 minutes, 20 seconds, be played, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. The Clerk of Court is directed to coordinate with Counsel for the Prosecution, accompanied by Counsel for the Respondent, to make sure that the USB identified by the witness will be the same one that will be played.

So ordered.

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. Presiding Officer.

The Presiding Officer. The Senate President.

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR-JUDGE GATCHALIAN

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. Mr. Presiding Officer, I just have a few questions while we're waiting for the video to play. This is in line with the authentication.

The Presiding Officer. The gentleman may proceed. He has 2 minutes.

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. *Sa ating Ginoong Testigo, narinig ko kanina, ilang beses, iyang "open-source investigation." Anong ibig sabihin ng open-source investigation?*

Mr. Calilung. *Ang ibig sabihin po noon is nag-gather po ako ng iba't ibang information na available sa internet, wherein anyone can access po iyang data na iyon.*

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. And *iyong iba't ibang information na iyon*, how do you prove whether those information are valid, authentic, *totoo*, in the age of fake news? *Ngayon, ang dami ng mga information na lumalabas.*

Mr. Calilung. *Iyong pinagkuhanan ko, Your Honor, noong mga information na iyon is from the official websites and official webpages po.*

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. Okay.

Mr. Calilung. To ensure that the, *ano po*, content is accurate.

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. Okay. And then, my next question: *Narinig ko rin kanina na mina-manual comparison ninyo iyang mga videos between, let's say, Facebook, and let's say, iyang video recording. Can you describe to us, anong ibig sabihin ng manual comparison?*

Mr. Calilung. *Ibig sabihin po noon, Your Honor, mayroon akong dalawang monitor during that time, and both videos were being played to ensure that the contents are identical po.*

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. *Ano iyan, nakaupo ka doon, tinitingnan mo iyang dalawa?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes *po*.

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. *Wala ka bang, let's say, software na will say, "Ito ay purely parehas—" itong dalawang video? Kasi ini-imagine ko lang, uupo ka doon, papanoorin mo iyang dalawang video. How do we know that 1:1 iyang video na kino-compare mo?*

Mr. Calilung. Based on—*nakikita naman po siya*, and based on the audio, sir, *na sabay po sila*.

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. *Ikaw lang iyon, ang tumitingin?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes po, and it was checked after *po*.

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. *Sino nagtse-check?*

Mr. Calilung. *Mayroon po akong nagre-review na executive officer and the chief po.*

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. *So, kayong dalawa ang nagsasabi na itong Facebook video and also itong video recording, talagang parehas na parehas?*

Mr. Calilung. The authentication itself *na affidavit po, ako lang po.*

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. Okay. *Mayroon ba kayong ginagamit na standards, in terms of comparison? Like for example, ito ay ginagamit ng international investigative body, ito ay isang standard na acceptable by international judicial process. Mayroon ba kayong ginagamit na standard acceptable by the judiciary or any courts?*

Mr. Calilung. *Iyong procedure ko po na ginawa is based lang po sa digital forensic procedure po.*

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. *Nino?*

Mr. Calilung. *Iyon po iyong ginagamit sa digital forensics, as a whole, iyong process po ng identification.*

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. But *iyong digital forensic procedure, ito ba ay internationally accepted procedure or locally lang?*

Mr. Calilung. It's a procedure that is acceptable internationally and in court *po*.

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. And then, *mayroon bang international accreditation stamp iyan or organization that approves it?*

Mr. Calilung. I have no personal knowledge, Your Honor, but I've been following the procedure.

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. And accepted by the courts?

Mr. Calilung. Yes *po*.

Senator-Judge Gatchalian. All right. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS

(Continuation)

The Presiding Officer. Thank you, Mr. Senate President.

The Clerk of Court is directed through the technical staff to kindly play the video, please.

At this juncture, a video presentation of former House Speaker Romualdez was shown on the screen.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

That is the portion. Your Honor, please, may we proceed?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Mr. Witness, *nasabi mo rin na iyong AFP— Armed Forces of the Philippines— ay nag-issue rin ng kanilang tugon sa mga naging paghabanta ng Vice-President. Ano ba iyong pruweba mo sa naging tugon ng Armed Forces of the Philippines?*

Mr. Calilung. I have a screenshot of the website of the Armed Forces of the Philippines titled, "Statement on Military Professionalism and National Unity" by Gen. Romeo Brawner Jr., sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Sinabi mo screenshot. Now, sino iyong kumuha ng screenshot na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. I did, sir, and I used my laptop.

Mr. Ligutan. *Anong ginawa mo sa screenshot na iyan kung mayroon man?*

Mr. Calilung. I first saved an electronic copy ng screenshot sa laptop and printed it.

Mr. Ligutan. *Saan na iyong printout ng screenshot na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. *Sinabmit ko po iyong copy sa Committee on Justice of House of Representatives.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *kung iyong printout ng screenshot ipapakita sa iyo, maa-identify mo ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, we are now in the process of presenting to you a printout of a screenshot from the AFP website with the title, "Statement on Military Professionalism and National Unity," that is previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-16. Okay. May you peruse the same, and the question is: What relation, if any, does that document have with the printout of the screenshot you mentioned?

Mr. Calilung. This is a copy.

Mr. Ligutan. How faithful, if at all, is this printout from the actual screenshots?

Mr. Calilung. The printout accurately reflects the screenshot, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. How do you know that the printout accurately reflects the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. I compared the printouts with the screenshot and the webpage of the AFP. I found that the contents are identical, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *sinabi mo rin...*

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for the record, we have the...

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). We have the copy of the document. How can he be identifying the document when he does not have that copy? Are you following a script?

Mr. Ligutan. Oh my goodness, Your Honor, please. I move that that statement by the defense of the witness, "following the script" be stricken out of record. For the record, Your Honor, the witness was perusing the document before he handed that to the defense. I move that the statements of the defense be stricken out, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). But he was answering the question.

The Presiding Officer. Comments of both counsels are simply noted. Kindly, if you're done with the document, counsel, kindly give it to the witness.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for the record, the right-hand portion of both documents contained certified true copies and a mere photocopy, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. The manifestation and objection are duly noted. Same ruling by this court. Witness may answer.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you. State for the record your answer.

Mr. Calilung. I have compared the screenshot with the printouts and the webpage, and found that the contents are identical, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, may I continue.

Mr. Witness, *sinabi mo rin na iyong PNP ay nag-issue rin ng kanilang statements sa mga naging pagbabanta ng Bise Presidente sa subject video. Ano ba ang pruwera mo, kung mayroon man, of/ that PNP statements?*

Mr. Calilung. I have the screenshot of the statement of the PNP on their Facebook official page dated November 23, 2024, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Sino ba ang kumuha ng screenshot na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. I did, sir, and I used my laptop.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ano ang ginawa mo sa screenshot na iyan, kung mayroon man?*

Mr. Calilung. *Nai-save ko po iyong screenshot doon sa laptop ko and then print it.*

Mr. Ligutan. And then *nai-print mo. Saan na iyong printout ng screenshot na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. *Nai-submit ko po sa Committee on Justice of the House of Representatives.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *saan na iyong printout ng screenshot na iyan?*

Mr. Mr. Calilung. *Nai-submit ko po sa Committee on Justice.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *kung iyong copy ng printout ng screenshot ay ipapakita sa iyo, will you be able to identify the same?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, I am showing you a printout of a screenshot *ng* Facebook post *ng* PNP dated November 23, 2024. The title is PNP Statement that is previously marked as exhibit P-IV-17. What relation, if any?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I ask—

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). May I ask that we be allowed to peruse before he asks his question to identify/ the document?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel is directed to kindly give opposing counsel for the respondent a copy of the document being presented to the witness.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, both documents appear to be photocopies, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Noted. And I presume the continuing objection and comment of counsel for respondent will be placed on record as well.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Witness may answer.

Mr. Calilung. It is a copy of the submitted document to the Committee of Justice, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. How faithful, if at all, is this printout *sa naging* actual screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. It accurately reflects the screenshot?

Mr. Ligutan. *At saka, paano mo nasabi na* that printout accurately reflects the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. I compared the screenshot with the printout and the webpage wherein this was posted and found that the contents are identical.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. So, let's go to the last agency, Mr. Witness. *Nasabi mo rin na iyong National Security Council o NSC ay nag-issue ng statement sa naging mga pagbabanta ng Vice-President, ano ba ang pruwera mo, kung meron man, sa naging tugon ng National Security Council or NSC?*

Mr. Calilung. I have the screenshot of the statement of National Security Council on the official webpage of the Presidential Communication Office, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Sino iyong kumuha ng screenshot?*

Mr. Calilung. I did, sir, and I used my laptop.

Mr. Ligutan. *Okay, ano ang ginawa mo, kung meron man, sa naging screenshot na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. *Sinave ko muna ang electronic copy ng screenshot sa laptop ko.*

Mr. Ligutan. *Saan na iyong screenshot na iyan, kung alam mo?*

Mr. Calilung. *Printint ko, sir.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *kung iyong kopya ng screenshot na iyan ay ipapakita sa iyo, maa-identify mo ba?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, we are in the process of showing you a printout, the defense may peruse the document *sa* screenshot ng National Security Council's statement previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-18.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, Exhibit P-IV-18 is a photocopy.

The Presiding Officer. Noted.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. May I ask the question?

The Presiding Officer. Kindly return the document to the witness so that the witness may answer.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, what relation, if any, does that document have with the printout of the screenshot you mentioned?

Mr. Calilung. This is the copy that was submitted to the Committee on Justice, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. How faithful, if at all, is that printout from the actual screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. It accurately reflects the screenshot, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And how do you know that that printout accurately reflects the screenshot?

Mr. Calilung. I compared the screenshot with the printouts and the webpage and found that the contents are identical, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay, done. Now, Mr. witness, let's proceed.

Sinabi mo rin na in the course, you conducted iyong open source investigation. Now, what happened, if any, in the course of your investigation in relation to the statements of the Vice-President after you collated the videos, the screenshots of the several governmental agencies?

Mr. Calilung. We then proceeded to the issuance of subpoenas, sir, to the following individuals who were present on November 23, 2024: Bons Magsambol, Red Mendoza, Dempsey Reyes, Anna Malindog Uy, Mikhail Flores, and Jayson Lubrico, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. Now, *iyong tanong*, Mr. Witness, is, *bakit kaya nag-issue, kung alam mo, bakit nag-issue iyong NBI ng subpoena sa mga taong ito?*

Mr. Calilung. *Nandoon po kasi sila sa...present sila during the November 23, 2024 online press conference, sir.*

Mr. Ligutan. All right. Now, *ano pa iyong nangyari, kung meron man, after iyong NBI mag-issue ng, ano bayan, subpoenas ba iyan, o subpoenae sa mga taong ito?*

Mr. Calilung. *Dumating po sa office namin si Dempsey Reyes and Bons Magsambol noong December 4, 2024 and in-assign po sa akin na i-interview at ako po iyong nag-interview.*

Mr. Ligutan. So, Your Honor, please, may Dempsey Reyes so rest in peace. Now, *ano ba iyong nangyari, kung meron man, during your interview with namayapang si Dempsey Reyes.*

Mr. Calilung. He confirmed po *na* he was present during the November 23, 2024 online press conference and he also confirmed that he heard the Vice- President uttered the statement, quote and quote. May I refer to the notes for the exact statement?

The Presiding Officer. The witness may do so.

Mr. Calilung. He confirmed the statement—he heard the statement of the Vice-President, “Yes, *‘wag kang mag-alala, ma’am, sa security ko kasi may kinausap na ako na tao, sinabi ko sa kanya...*”

Mr. Narvasa (C). May I object? This is hearsay.

The Presiding Officer. Objection is sustained. Counsel, clearly, you’re trying to use this witness to present an affidavit of another person who has already passed.

Mr. Ligutan. If I may, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel may respond.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, that is not an affidavit of the Dempsey Reyes, Your Honor, please. The question was, what happened during his interview with that person. And he has just answered the question by saying that Dempsey Reyes confirmed that he was there and that he heard the Vice-President uttering the statement, Your Honor, please. That’s not hearsay, Your Honor, please. And, be that as it may, Your Honor, please, we invoke a doctrine that we call an independently relevant statements (IRS). The defense is reacting. I don’t know why. Your Honor, please, IRS would allow this witness to testify as to what the other person told him as to that fact, the making of the statements, as to whether or not what the person said is true or not, that is not material at this point, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Let the Court clarify them.

As to tenor, the Court will allow it; as to the supposed fact that the witness told this Dempsey Reyes made those utterances to the witness, but not as to the truth of what Dempsey Cyden Reyes said. As to subject to that clarification, the Court will allow it.

Counsel, proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor please.

What about this Bonz Magsambol, *ano ba ang nangyari sa* interview with him *kung mayroon man?*

Mr. Calilung. Bonz Magsambol also confirmed that he was present—

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor. Same objection.

Mr. Ligutan. And same ruling, I suppose.

The Presiding Officer. Let the witness first answer and the Court will make a ruling because he might have a different answer. Because counsel, note, the affidavit of the witness appended the affidavit of this Bonz guy but did not do so with the affidavit of Dempsey. So, Presiding Officer will listen to the witness before ruling on the matter and we may have the same ruling unless he gives a different answer.

Please, witness, what is your answer? Mr. Witness, kindly answer.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.

Bonz Magsambol also confirmed that he was present on the November 23, 2024 online press conference held by the office of the Vice-President, and he also confirmed that he heard the utterance of the Vice-President making the statement.

The Presiding. Same ruling, only as to tenor, the Court will admit it; not as to the truth that, indeed, what Bonz said is true, but only as to the fact that he told the witness those statements in the Q&A that they had.

What is the pleasure of Senator-Judge Raffy Tulfo?

CLARIFICATORY QUESTIONS OF SENATOR-JUDGE TULFO (R)

Senator-Judge Tulfo (R). Mr. Presiding Officer, I just have some clarificatory questions for you.

The Presiding Officer . The gentlemen may proceed and he has two minutes.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (R). Expert witness, *sabi mo meron kang* two weeks lecture-experience as a digital evidence expert, is that right? Two weeks?

Mr. Calilung. Two weeks training.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (R). *Wala ka nang iba pang* training?

Mr. Calilung. I have a training on different digital forensic aspect.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (R). *Dito? Sa* abroad? *Meron?*

Mr. Calilung. *Meron po, pero iyong specific sa* photo and video authentication, *iyon po iyong* two weeks.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (R). So, all in all, in total you have two weeks experience plus two weeks lecture *lang pagdating sa* authentication, *iyong* forensic evidence?

Mr. Calilung. For the photo and video, sir.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (R). For the photo and video, which *ito iyong pinag-usapan natin* ngayon?

Mr. Calilung. Yes po.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (R). Now, my question to you. In your testimony, Mr. Witness, you did mention that you personally investigated the alleged inciting to sedition by the VP Sara Duterte video, correct?

Mr. Ligutan. Yes, Your Honor.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (R). Now, in doing so, in the course of your investigation, did you look at the comments section? If you did, *ano iyong mga reactions doon, ano iyong mga statements doon sa* comments section *ng mga nag-view ng* video?

Mr. Calilung. There are comments that they agreed to the statement of the Vice-President, but it was not documented, sir.

Senator-Judge Tulfo (R). That's all, Mr. President officer. Thank you.

The Presiding Officer. Thank you, Senator-Judge Tulfo (R).

Counsel, you may proceed.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS

(Continuation)

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor.

Mr. Witness, let's proceed. What proof, if any, do you have that Dempsey Reyes confirmed that he heard the Vice-President uttered those words?

Mr. Calilung. I have the signed minutes of interview with Dempsey Reyes and an affidavit that I executed attesting to the interview, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. Now, what about this Bonz Magsambol? What proof, if any, do you have that he confirmed that he heard the Vice President uttered those words?

Mr. Calilung. I have the minutes of interview with Bonz Magsambol, sir, that he signed and I also have the affidavit that attesting that I interviewed Bonz Magsambol, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. So, so far, Mr. Witness, you mentioned one minutes and affidavits. Now, *kung iyong mga dokumentong ito ipapakita sa iyo*, you think you'll be able to identify the same?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, I'm now showing you a document entitled Signed Minutes that is previously marked as Exhibit B-IV-20 and series. Please peruse that documents.

Mr. Narvasa (C). May the defense be allowed also to peruse, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the defense says that the counsel for respondent may look at the document.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for the record, the documents marked as Exhibit P-IV-20 to P-IV-20e are photocopies. And Exhibit P-IV-20d is unreadable, as well as P-IV-20e, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Which one is unreadable, counsel?

Mr. Narvasa (C). P-IV-20d and P-IV-20e.

The Presiding Officer. 20d?

Mr. Narvasa (C). D for dog, Your Honor. D and E. Delta Echo.

The Presiding Officer. What does the P-IV-20d seek to show? Counsel, for the prosecution?

Mr. Ligutan. If I may peruse the document, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Because, indeed the Presiding Officer confirms that I cannot decipher what it seeks to show, unless the photocopy of a photocopy is what I have?

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please. So, may we be given two minutes to secure the other copies of that document.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor—

The Presiding Officer. And P-IV-20e?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. This is the one with the blurred face of the Vice- President?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Supposedly on the computer?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may we object on the two minutes because this is the document. They are already having him identify. Do they mean to correct that mistake?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, do not waste the Court's time in regard to this.

Mr. Ligutan. Yes, Your Honor. If I may.

The Presiding Officer. Yes, Counsel, for the prosecution.

Mr. Ligutan. We abide by the copies as they are. We abide by the copies as they are, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. So let's see.

Mr. Witness, what do you see in front of you insofar as P-IV-20d and e is concerned?

So *parehong malabo iyong copy natin. Iyan at iyong kopya ko din.*

Mr. Witness, if you don't see anything, it's okay.

Mr. Calilung. I can only confirm the signed minutes, but the annexes, there are some unreadable, Your Honor. But the signed minutes, I confirm that this is the—

The Presiding Officer. The what?

Mr. Calilung. The copy of the minutes.

The Presiding Officer. Of the minutes but not the attachments because clearly the attachments P-IV-20d and e are both unclear.

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Is that correct?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.



The Presiding Officer. So only as to the supposed affidavit and not to the two attachments, you can identify them?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Noted.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you. So much.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, on page 4 of the signed minutes, Mr. Witness, there appears a signature above the name Dempsey Cyden Reyes, whose signature is that, if you know?

Mr. Calilung. It is the signature of Dempsey Reyes, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And how do you know that that is his signature?

Mr. Calilung. I saw him sign the document after our interview, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, on page 4 of the signed minutes, *may pirma din sa ibabaw ng pangalan ng isang Atty. Jethro Lorenza A. Cuon. Kaninong signature ito, kung alam mo?*

Mr. Calilung. Signature of Atty. Cuon po, who is the counsel of Dempsey Reyes and present during the interview, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And how do you know that that is his signature?

Mr. Calilung. I saw him sign the document after the interview, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, sa page 4 ng signed minutes let's go to page 4, Mr. Witness, *makikita mo diyan iyong signature sa ibabaw ng pangalang Agent John Mark Calilung.* Whose signature is that, if you know?

Mr. Calilung. It is my signature, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, you also mentioned *ng mga affidavit. Kung iyong affidavit na ito ay ipapakita sa iyo*, will you be able to identify the same?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *ipinapakita ko sa iyo iyong affidavit* dated February 10, 2025.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may we also be allowed to peruse it? Thank you.

The Presiding Officer. Kindly exhibit and show to counsel for the respondent the document you are showing to the witness.

Mr. Ligutan. That is previously marked Exhibit P-14-19 and series. And if the Court may inquire as to the remainder of the testimony of this witness, we are about to windup [down] the testimony of this witness, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for the record, this is a photocopy. This is Exhibit P-4-19.

The Presiding Officer. Noted.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Mr. Witness, have you perused the documents? Have you perused the document? *Nabasa mo na ba yung dokumentong iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, what relation, if any, does that document have with the affidavit you mentioned?

Mr. Calilung. This is the affidavit attesting my interview with Dempsey Reyes, Sir. This is a copy of the affidavit, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, on page 2 of the affidavit, *may makikitang pirma sa ibabaw ng pangalang Agent John Mark Calilung. Kaninong pirma ba yan?*

Mr. Calilung. It is my signature, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, on page 2, *may pirma din sa ibabaw ng pangalang Atty. Van Homer Angluben. Kaninong pirma ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Signature po ni Atty. Angluben, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Bakit mo nalaman na iyan ay isang pirma ni Atty. Angluben?*

Mr. Calilung. I saw him sign the document, and I have viewed and acted upon documents bearing his signature *kaya familiar po ako*.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

I am now showing you the other affidavit on even date, February 10, 2025, that is previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-21 and series. May you peruse the same?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, may I be allowed— thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Kindly show counsel for the respondent a copy of the document that the witness will testify to.

Mr. Narvasa (C). For the record, Your Honor, the Exhibit P-IV-21 and Exhibit P-IV-21a are photocopies.

The Presiding Officer. Duly noted. Kindly return the document to the witness for his perusal.

Mr. Narvasa (C). We are returning the document to the witness, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, please proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor, please.

What relation, if any, have you answered the question, does this document have with the one you mentioned?

Mr. Calilung. This is a copy of the affidavit of interview with Bonz Magsambol. Your Honor, yes, this is a copy, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, on page 2 of the affidavit, *may pirma sa ibabaw ng pangalang* Agent John Mark Calilung. *Kaninong pirma ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. This is my signature, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Sa page 2, may makikita rin isang pirma sa ibabaw ng pangalang* Atty. Van Homer Angluben. *Kaninong pirma ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. This is the signature of Atty. Van Angluben, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Bakit mo nalaman na iyan ay isang pirma ni Atty. Angluben?*

Mr. Calilung. *Nakita ko na pinirmahan po iyong* document, and *may mga* documents *pa po akong nakita na pirmado niya*.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, Mr. Witness, thank you so much. Now we are showing you *iyong dokumento* entitled "Signed Minutes," that is previously marked Exhibit P-IV-22 and series. May you peruse the same. Defense, may also peruse the documents.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Kindly show a copy to the Counsel for Respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, Exhibit P-IV-22 to Exhibit P-IV-22g are photocopies, and Exhibit P-IV-22f, Foxtrot, and P-IV-22g, golf, are unreadable. For the record, we are returning the document to the witness.

The Presiding Officer. For the record as well, the Chair confirms the observation of Counsel for the Respondent in regard to P-IV-22f and P-IV-22g. And, the Presiding Officer would like to once again ask the witness, can he decipher what is in the two exhibits mentioned by Counsel for the Respondent? Again, P-IV-22f, P-IV-22g.

Mr. Calilung. Your Honor, I can confirm the signed minutes, but the attachments, they are unreadable, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. The two exhibits?



Mr. Calilung. Annex A and Annex B, with Exhibit 4-22f and P-IV-22g.

The Presiding Officer. Duly noted.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

May I proceed, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. Please proceed, counsel.

Mr. Ligutan. On Page 6 ng "Signed Minutes," *may makikitang pirma sa ibabaw ng pangalang Bonz Magsambol, kaninong pirma ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. This is the signature of Bonz Magsambol, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And then, how do you know that *pirma iyan ni Bonz Magsambol?*

Mr. Calilung. *Nakita ko po ito noong sinayn (sign) po niya iyong document after ng interview.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, you go to Page 6 ng signed minutes *na iyan. May makikitang pirma sa ibabaw ng pangalang Atty. Michael Christopher De Castro. Kaninong pirma ba iyan, kung alam mo?*

Mr. Calilung. *Pirma po ito ni Atty. De Castro, counsel po ni Bonz Magsambol during the time ng interview na present during that time.*

Mr. Ligutan. Noong tanungin, paano mo nalaman na iyan ay pirma ni Atty. De Castro?

Mr. Calilung. *Nakita ko pong pinirmahan niya ito after the interview, Sir.*

Mr. Ligutan. Now, let's go to Page 6 of that minutes. *May makikitang pirma sa ibabaw ng pangalang Agent John Mark Calilung, kaninong pirma ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. *Pirma ko po, Sir.*

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, Mr. Witness— Mr. Witness, you mentioned that the NBI conducted an investigation on the threats uttered by the Vice President against the President, First Lady, *at saka* former Speaker of the House of Representatives. Now, *ano ba iyong nangyari? Ano ba iyong nangyari, kung meron man, pagkatapos ng naging imbestigasyon ng NBI?*

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor, misleading. He assumes as fact not testified to by the witness.

The Presiding Officer. Kindly rephrase, Counsel.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, what happened next, if any, and if you know, and in relation to the investigation conducted by the NBI after the NBI's investigation?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor. Same objection.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, if I may—

The Presiding Officer. Witness, may I answer?

Mr. Calilung. After the investigation, we executed an Affidavit of Investigation and recommended the filing of inciting to sedition and three counts of grave threat, both in relation to the Cybercrime Prevention Act of 2012, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, sinabi mo na iyong NBI, you signed, executed iyong affidavit of investigation, correct?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *ano ba iyong nangyari, kung meron man, at saka kung alam mo, okay, pagkatapos ma-execute iyong Affidavit of Investigation na iyan* in relation to the investigation you did on the Vice President?

Mr. Calilung. We filed it to the DOJ, the Affidavit of Investigation together with its annexes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. You said you filed the affidavit. Now, question: *Ano yung mga nangyari kung meron man, kung alam mo, after ma-file iyang Affidavit of Investigation with the DOJ in relation to the investigation you conducted on the Vice President?*

Mr. Calilung. We further conduct an investigation wherein we identified different videos, at least three, that we find relevant to the November 23, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay, so you are now mentioning videos. *Sinabi mo*, relevant. Relevant again to what?

Mr. Calilung. The November 23, 2024 video, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. So, for the record, this is now the third set of videos you are referring to?

Mr. Calilung. Yes.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *ano iyang mga videos na ito kung alam mo*, Mr. Witness?

Mr. Calilung. The June 19 video wherein the Vice President resigned as the Secretary of the Department of Education, the July 11 video wherein the Vice President states that she did not attend the SONA, but instead declared herself as the designated survivor. And lastly, the November 26 video wherein the Vice President did not deny making statement but instead confirmed that she already talked to someone to kill the President, the First Lady, and former Speaker of the House if she was killed.

Mr. Ligutan. So, for the record, you mentioned three videos: one is dated June 19, 2024, June 11, 2024, *saka* November 26 ba iyon? 2024? Now, let's go to these videos *na sinabi mong* Vice President resigning as the Secretary ng Department of Education on June 19. *Ano iyang pruwera mo* that you have—*na sinabi mo rin na-authenticate mo iyang* video, correct?

Mr. Calilung. Yes po.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ano iyang pruwera mo* that you authenticated this video?

Mr. Calilung. I have executed an Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence dated April 30, 2026, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Kung iyang kopya ng Affidavit of Authentication* now dated, *sinabi mo*, April 30, 2026, *maipapakita sa iyo*, okay, *ma-a-identify mo ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, we are in the process of showing you *iyang isang* Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence dated April 30, 2026 that is previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-25 and series.

Defense is in the process of manifestation of perusing that documents.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, Exhibits—

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Mr. Narvasa. Thank you, Your Honor.

Exhibit P-IV-25 to Exhibit P-IV-25F, are photocopies, Your Honor. And Exhibits P-XIV-25B and P-XIV-25F, let's take it to P-IV-25B, Your Honor, P-XII-25B is unreadable and it merely shows a black screen. Meanwhile, P-IV-25F, it seems to be a photocopy of a USB with no USB, real USB attached. For the record, we are returning the document.

The Presiding Officer. Duly noted. The presiding officer likewise confirms the observation of Counsel for the Respondent. Kindly return the document to the witness.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, the question is, what relation, if any, does that document have with the affidavit you mentioned?

Mr. Calilung. This is the copy of the Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence dated April 30, 2026, which I executed, and on the annexes, one Annex B, there is a missing part, it may be due to—I can't read some words on Annex B.

The Presiding Officer. Mr. Witness, when you say Annex B, you're referring to Exhibit P-IV-25C?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. For the record, please proceed.

Mr. Calilung. And also on Annex D, Exhibit P-IV-25E, there is some missing, but the only missing is the hash file, maybe due to printing.

The Presiding Officer. For the record, unrecognizable.

Mr. Narvasa (C). For the record, Your Honor, the hash file is missing. The witness said the hash file is missing.

The Presiding Officer. The hash file is missing, as stated by the witness, yes.

Please proceed, Mr. Witness. How about P-IV-25F?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, I confirm, Your Honor, that's a photocopy of the flash drive.

The Presiding Officer. What do you confirm, na picture ng USB ito?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Your Honor, a picture of the flash drive.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Please proceed, Counsel for the Prosecution.

Mr. Calilung. But this is the Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay, please repeat your answer.

Mr. Calilung. This is the Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence that I executed, but there are—on the annexes that I mentioned, there are some that are unreadable.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you. May I make a manifestation, Your Honor, please, as to this affidavit that pertains to a video—

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. —as to the video of the Vice President resigning, Your Honor, please. And we are supposed to present the flash drive that the Defense pointed that they only have the photocopy. Be that as it may, Your Honor, please, we are waiving the presentation of the video of the Vice President resigning because, Your Honor, in the pre-trial order, specifically on page three drafts, the Defense already admitted that the Vice President resigned on June 19, 2024.

The Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer was exactly about to state that, there is no need for the counsel for the prosecution to present evidence on an admitted fact.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much, Your Honor, please. May I proceed, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, Mr. Witness, you also mentioned that you authenticated a video where the Vice President said that she would not attend the SONA and instead publicly declared herself as the "designated survivor." What, if any, do you have that you authenticated the video?

Mr. Calilung. It's part of the Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence dated April 30, 2026, which I previously identified, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. What happened next, if any, after you authenticated the video of the Vice President announcing that she is skipping the SONA and declaring herself as the designated survivor?

Mr. Calilung. I saved the video on my laptop and saved a copy on a flash drive, sir.

Mr. Ligutan. You saved a copy in a flash drive. Now, if this flash drive of the—containing the video where the Vice President said she declared herself as the designated survivor after skipping the SONA is shown to you, will you be able to identify the same?



Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, we are now in the process of confronting you with a flash drive that is previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-24a for the prosecution containing the recording of the Vice President where she said that she would not attend the SONA, and, instead, declared herself as the "designated survivor", previously marked as P-IV-24 for the prosecution.

Mr. Calilung. Permission to unseal the flash drive, Sir?

The Presiding Officer. You may do so, Mr. Witness.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.

This is the flash drive where I saved the recording, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, you also mentioned that you authenticated a video that on November 26, 2024, the Vice President did not deny, and, instead, confirmed her utterances of contracting an assassin to kill the President and the two others. What proof, if any, do you have that you authenticated a video?

Mr. Calilung. I have executed an Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence dated April 27, 2026, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. And then, aside from that affidavit, do you have other proof, if any?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor, leading.

Mr. Ligutan. If any, Your Honor, if any.

Mr. Narvasa (C). It is still answerable by yes or no.

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, please. Can the witness be directed to wait until the Court rules an objection before answering?

The Presiding Officer. The witness is so directed.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

Mr. Ligutan. So, what is that, if any?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir. I also executed an Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence dated June 11, 2026.

Mr. Ligutan. So, you mentioned two affidavits in result, correct, Mr. Witness?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, I am showing you a document entitled Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence dated April 27, 2026, that is previously marked as Ex. P-IV-27 and series. May you peruse the same?

Manifestation, Your Honor—defense is in the process perusing the same documents.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for the record, the Ex. P-IV-27 to Ex. P-IV-27d are photocopies, and on Ex. P-IV-27d, it would seem to be a mere photocopy of a USB—an image of a USB—and no actual USB appended.

The Presiding Officer. The Chair confirms the observation of the counsel for respondent insofar as P-IV-27d is concerned.

Kindly return the document to the witness so that he may answer.



Mr. Ligutan. So, what relation, if any, does that document have with the affidavit that you mentioned?

Mr. Calilung. This is the copy of the Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence that I executed, Sir, dated April 27, 2026.

Mr. Ligutan. And on Page 2 of that affidavit, *may makikitang pirma sa ibabaw ng pangalang John Mark Calilung, kaninong pirma ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Signature *ko*, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Then, *sa* Page 2 *ng* affidavit, *may makikitang pirma sa ibabaw ng pangalan ng isang Atty. Rhea Vanessa Asuncion, kaninang pirma ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. *Pirma po ni* Atty. Asuncion, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *At paano mo nalaman na iyan ay isang pirma ni* Atty. Asuncion?

Mr. Calilung. *Nakita po ko ng pinirmahan niya ang document*, and I have acted upon documents bearing her signature, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. All right. Mr. Witness, you also mentioned of the other affidavit on the collection preservation, *sinabi mo* dated June 11, 2026, *hindi po ba?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ngayon, kung ang affidavit na iyan ipapakita sa iyo, maa-identify mo ba yung affidavit na iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, I am showing you—the prosecution is showing you—a copy of that affidavit that is previously marked Ex. P-IV-28, and series for the prosecution. May you peruse the same.

And, for the record, Your Honor, I am about to ask a few more questions, and the prosecution is finally done with this first witness, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Noted.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for Exhibit P-IV-28 to Exhibit P-IV-28h, these are photocopies.

And, Your Honor, we note the Affidavit on the Collection Preservation and Authentication of Digital Evidence in page 2, which is Exhibit P-IV-28a, mentions a copy of an Affidavit of Authentication of Digital Evidence dated January 30, 2025, is attached here as Annex A under Footnote 1, but upon perusal, no Annex A is attached to the affidavit.

On Exhibit P-IV-28b, under footnote 2, it says a copy of the preservation request dated 24 November 2024 is attached as Annex B, but we note that there is no preservation request or Annex B appended.

As Footnote No. 3 of the same exhibit, a copy of the email dated November 28, 2024, from Meta is attached herewith as Annex C. However, no Annex C is appended on the affidavit.

As Footnote No. 4, it says a copy of the authenticated recording of the video of the online livestream press conference of the Vice President held on 23 November 2024, and it says it is attached here as Annex D. However, no Annex D is attached on this affidavit.

As Footnote No. 5, a copy of the printout of the screenshot of hash file VP November 23 presscon at the Batasan is attached herewith as Annex E. However, no hash value or printout thereof is appended as any Annex E.

As Footnote 6 of the same exhibit, it says a copy of the VP November 23 presscon at Batasan CCD transcript is attached as Annex F, and a copy of the Affidavit of Transcription dated 20 December 2024 is attached as Annex G. However, no Batasan CCD transcript of the November 23 presscon or Affidavit of Transcription are attached as Annexes F or G, respectively.

For Exhibit P-IV-28c, the footnote 7 says a copy of the authenticated 18 October 2024 video is attached as Annex H. However, no Annex H or an authenticated video is attached hereon.

As Footnote No. 8, a copy of the printout of the screenshot of the hash file is attached as Annex I. However, no printout of such a hash file is found on this document.

Mr. Ligutan. If I may. Are we done?

Mr. Narvasa (C). No.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay, proceed.

Mr. Narvasa (C). On Exhibit P-IV-28d, footnote 9 says, a copy of the VPSD brief, press briefing, dated 18, October 2024, CCD transcript is attached as Annex J, and a copy of the affidavit of transcription, dated 3 February 2025 is attached as Annex K. However, no press briefing or affidavit of transcription, dated February 3, 2025 are appended as annex—

The Presiding Officer. With the permission of the counsel for respondent, to abbreviate the proceedings, counsel for the prosecution, will you stipulate that none of the attachments contained in the footnote until Annex KK is attached to the affidavit that you are presenting the witness?

Mr. Ligutan. With a counter manifestation, Your Honor, please, that this latest affidavit of authentication tries to summarize each and every other affidavit authentication. So, as to the concern of the defense, Your Honor, please, this is just a summary of all the other affidavits of authentication so stipulated.

The Presiding Officer. Subject of qualification but, indeed, it did not contain and does not contain the annexes purported to be part of this affidavit.

Does counsel of respondent confirm that it is up to Annex KK?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, we confirm.

The Presiding Officer. “KK,” *tama ba?*

Mr. Narvasa (C). We confirm that it is until “KK,” Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Noted, subject to the brief manifestation of counsel, but, indeed, the Presiding Officer confirms that none of the annexes contained in all of the footnotes until Annex KK is attached to the affidavit being presented to the witness.

Noted.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, please, thank you so much.

May I proceed?

The Presiding Officer. Yes, counsel for respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, for the record, may we return the document to the witness.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, have you perused that documents?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir, this is a copy of the affidavit of authentication— collection, preservation, authentication of digital evidence, dated June 11, 2026, and it does not have annexes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. May I proceed, Your Honor, please?

The Presiding Officer. The counsel may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Mr. Witness, what happened next, if any, after you authenticated the video of the Vice President that on November 26, 2024, you said, the Vice President did not deny that she made the threats, and, in fact, she confirmed her utterances should something happen to her? What happened next, if any, after that?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. What is the objection of counsel?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Misleading, Your Honor. No mention of—the witness did not mention this.

The Presiding Officer. The witness may answer.



Mr. Calilung. I saved the video of the November 26, 2024 online interview on my computer and on a flash drive.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Your Honor, before the counsel proceeds.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for respondent.

Mr. Narvasa (C). May I request that the counsel for the prosecution refrain from characterization, testifying on what the document or the video is. So, Your Honor, I request that.

Mr. Ligutan. Your Honor, I am just merely describing an affidavit or a document or an object that this witness already testified to. I am just repeating what the witness said. I am not adding any value whatsoever to what the witness already testified to, Your Honor, please.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Precisely, Your Honor, and this is precisely my point.

Mr. Ligutan. And there is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Precisely my point, Your Honor. It's improper.

Mr. Ligutan. Nothing in the rules would disallow me to do that, Your Honor, please.

The Presiding Officer. Will counsels kindly wait for the presiding officer to recognize them before they speak?

Counsel, I will instead advise the Senator-Judges to kindly listen, take note of the pieces of evidence presented through a witness under oath and subject to cross-examination, and not statements made by either counsel that are conclusions of fact and/or law in arriving at their decision.

The Chair will be more mindful of counsel for respondent insofar as that is concerned.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel for the prosecution, you may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you.

Mr. Witness, you mentioned about a flash drive, correct?

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Now, *kung iyong flash drive na iyan, ipapakita sa iyo, maa-identify mo ba iyan?*

Mr. Calilung. Yes, po.

Mr. Ligutan. *Ngayon, ipinapakita ko iyong flash drive na previously marked as Exhibit P-14-26, containing the video recording of the Vice President on November 26, 2024 that is previously marked as Exhibit P-IV-26. May you peruse the same?*

Mr. Calilung. Permission to unseal the flash drive, Sir.

The Presiding Officer. Witness may do so.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.

This is the flash drive where I saved the recording, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. Thank you so much.

Now, you mentioned that you authenticated the recording of the video of the Vice President on November 26, 2024. Okay. *Sinabi mo*, the Vice President did not deny that she made the threat. In fact, she made—I am not yet done, Mr. Witness. Now, the question now is, in what particular portion of that video did the Vice President not deny that she made those threats, if you know?

Mr. Calilung. Permission to refer to my investigator's note, Sir.

The Presiding Officer. You may do so.

Mr. Calilung. Thank you, Your Honor.



Timestamp: 00:10:40 to timestamp 00:11:50, Sir.

Mr. Ligutan. So, it is from timestamp 00:10:40 to 00:11:50. A quick calculation, that would be 1 minute and 19 seconds, Mr. Witness.

Mr. Calilung. Yes, Sir, 1 minute and 10 seconds.

Mr. Ligutan. I am about to show you now that 1 minute and 18 seconds portion, particularly from timestamps 00:10:40 to 00:11:50. May we allow Atty. Stephen Magallon?

The Presiding Officer. Will one of the counsels for respondent accompany the counsel for the prosecution to make sure that it is the same USB identified by the witness that will be played by the tech of the Clerk of Clerk.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Thank you, Your Honor.

(Video Presentation)

At this juncture, the following is the text of the video presentation, with Vice President Sara Zimmerman Duterte speaking:

"Me, another person warned me, and then I was asked, during a press briefing, by a media person if I know of these plans, if you can say the word—if that is the correct word to use here—plans. So, I answered, I was asked, Romanov, and then I answered—I was told by two people—this is the first time I have heard of Romanov. So, that is the third already, and I said, 'Don't worry about my security, if they kill me, if I die, kapag pinatay ako o kapag namatay ako, in the context of 'don't worry about my security.' So, this means pinatay ka, di ba? Kasi hindi ka naman mamamatay by heart attack in relation to your security, di ba? So pag namatay ako, I already asked a person to take revenge against three individuals. So, my question now—"

Mr. Ligutan. So, last question for this prosecution witness.

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, may proceed.

Mr. Ligutan. Kinukumpirma mo, Mr. Witness, when confronted with the question whether she uttered those threats against the President, the First Lady, the former Speaker of the House, the Vice President did not deny and she confirms she made those threats.

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, Your Honor.

The Presiding Officer. What is the objection?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Leading.

Mr. Ligutan. Witness may not answer—

The Presiding Officer. Counsel, kindly rephrase. It's your last question? Kindly rephrase.

Mr. Ligutan. Okay. Now, Mr. Witness, *base sa video na iyan, makikita mo ba, base sa video na iyan, na iyong Vice President*, instead of denying, she confirmed that she made those threats?

Mr. Narvasa (C). Objection, leading.

Mr. Ligutan. I will withdraw the question.

That's all for this witness, Your Honor, please.

DIRECTIVE OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER

Presiding Officer Escudero deferred the respondent's cross-examination of the witness until the following day's hearing, in accordance with the request of several Senator-Judges and by order of the Chair.

He likewise directed the witness and Atty. Jeremy Lotoc to appear as previously required under the same subpoenas, noting that the subpoenas issued to the two NBI agents covered two hearing dates.

MOTION OF THE PROSECUTION

Attorney Ligutan raised an administrative matter and moved that the previously unsealed flash drive exhibits be resealed in the presence of representatives of both parties and countersigned by their respective counsels to preserve the integrity of the exhibits.

ORDER OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER

The Presiding Officer granted the motion and directed that the USB flash drive exhibits be resealed after adjournment under the supervision of counsel for both parties, who would likewise affix their signatures to the seals. Attorney Ligutan manifested his conformity with the arrangement.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL

The Presiding Officer *motu proprio* declared the impeachment trial adjourned until two o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday, July 8, 2026.

It was 6:23 p.m.

I hereby certify to the correctness of the foregoing.

Approved on July 8, 2026

Atty. RENATO N. BANTUG JR.

Clerk of Court

